Seton Hall University
eRepository @ Seton Hall

Seton Hall University Dissertations and Theses (ETDs)

Seton Hall University Dissertations and Theses

2001

A Study of the Impact of Teacher Perceptions on the Implementation of the Success for All Program in an Urban School District in New Jersey

Joseph Sinatra Fulmore Sr.
Seton Hall University

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarship.shu.edu/dissertations

 Part of the Educational Assessment, Evaluation, and Research Commons, Educational Leadership Commons, Educational Methods Commons, Elementary and Middle and Secondary Education Administration Commons, and the Urban Education Commons

Recommended Citation
Fulmore, Joseph Sinatra Sr., "A Study of the Impact of Teacher Perceptions on the Implementation of the Success for All Program in an Urban School District in New Jersey" (2001). *Seton Hall University Dissertations and Theses (ETDs)*. 2346.
https://scholarship.shu.edu/dissertations/2346

A STUDY OF THE IMPACT OF TEACHER PERCEPTIONS ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE SUCCESS FOR ALL PROGRAM IN AN URBAN SCHOOL DISTRICT IN NEW JERSEY.

BY

Joseph Sinatra Fulmore, Sr.

Dissertation Committee

Elaine Walker, Ph. O. Mentor

Daniel Gutmore, Ph. D.

Clarence H. Hoover, III, Ed. D.

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements of the Degree of Doctor of Education
Administration Seton Hall University
2001

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

To my personal and special Dream Team, better known as members of my dissertation committee: Dr. Elaine Walker, who actively encouraged me to continue my education and made sure that my understanding of statistics was a priority. Dr. Daniel Gutmore for keeping me focused and work driven. Dr. Clarence H. Hoover, III, whose hard work and insight were instrumental in the orderly progression of this dissertation. To Professor R. Richards for keeping my priorities in order as a friend. I also offer my deep-felt gratitude to Dr. Edwin Duroy, Dr. Charles Mitchell and Dr. James Caulfield, and Mr. Steven Flexser.

An extra special thank you goes to Ms. L. Cole, Ms. H. Browner, Ms. M. Bradley, Mr. J. Neighbor, Mr. K. Sumter, Ms. D. LaGarde, Ms. J. Lyde, Dr. R. Baskerville, Dr. M. Osborne, Ms. V. Dade, Mr. S. Zuidema, Ms. H. Nelson, Ms. L. Penny, Ms. B. Rizzo, Ms. E. Jones, Ms. J. Huntington, Ms. S. Washington, Ms. J. James, and Ms. A. Huntley, for their time and patience.

Finally, I humbly acknowledge the support and encouragement of my staff and friends, who have supported and sustained me in my never-ending quest for wisdom and attainment.

To all of the above, I extend to you my deepest gratitude.

DEDICATIONS

This study is dedicated to
the memory of my father and mother
Becker & Laura Fulmore.
To my loving and understanding wife Virginia,
who was steadfast, supportive, and
understanding, keeping the family focus, I thank
you:
To my immediate family, who give depth to my life and life to my dreams-my son Joseph, Jr., thank you for your saying,"Dad you can do it", my daughter, Jada Nicole,"That's my dad", my son Cheyenne, and his wife Selena, "dad its yours, you already claim it", my grandchildren, Ervin Nicole and Garrett Tyler, you light up my life.
To my matriarch sister, Pauline, thanks for being mom, my brother Cecil, thanks for being dad, thank you Roosevelt, Myrtle, Hazel, and Linda.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES
TABLE

CHAPTER I:
INTRODUCTION

Introduction

Theories of change developed and analyzed by Fullan & Steisel (1991) address some of the means for pursuing the effective implementation of school reform. Fullan stated that reforms are a process, not an event, and that to achieve school reform teachers must first of all recognize a need for change. Fullan further stressed that once a problem has been identified, teachers themselves must play a major role in resolving it—at least if a solution is to occur. During this process, however, conflict is inevitable because the change process is multidimensional; it both involves new practices and an alteration of beliefs. In turn, members of the school must redefine their roles and responsibilities as they immerse themselves in the process of change (Fullan & Steisel, 1991).

Cuban (1988) noted that there are two stages of reform in the change process. First-order changes are structural changes that are intended to make the school more effective and efficient. During this stage, the day-to-day activities

of the school have been facilitated. Second order changes, by their very nature, are more difficult to achieve. They require the creation of new goals, new structures, and transformed roles, all of which represent new ways of doing things for the teachers. Sergiovanni (1996) stressed that as schools redefine the roles of teachers, and as shared values are created, teachers will become self-managing in order to facilitate change.

The Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy study entitled A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century (1986) defined "restructuring" as a means of empowering teachers and, thereby, of improving the effectiveness of schools. Timar (1989) spelled out a more inclusive definition that seeks to broaden the concept to include programs to be implemented and organizational changes to be effectuated which would impel the school in the direction of more productive outcomes. In essence, therefore, restructuring is dictated by the way in which programs and activities are adopted and implemented. Whole-school reform thus requires restructuring through new activities and programs such as the empowering of staff, the acquisition of new skills, and provision for collaborative decision-making and goal setting.

Shared decision-making, however, is not easily achieved. It takes considerable time and effort for teachers, administrators, and parents to learn how to share

decisions in a way that leads to genuine, lasting improvement. In one study of a successful program, it was noted by Bondy et al. (1994) that at the Coral Springs (Maryland) Middle School, the entire community had been involved in a shared decision-making process for more than five years. When shared decision-making was implemented at Coral Springs in 1989, school personnel and parents were confident that the process would succeed at their school. In fact, Coral Springs was already what researchers term a "high readiness" school because it had a history of faculty involvement in decision-making, strong faculty support for school reform, and cooperative and trusting relationships between the school administration and its faculty (Bondy et al., 1994).

Coral Springs, however, is the exception rather than the rule. Researchers have found that most schools have had difficulty implementing shared decision-making (Collins & Hanson, 1991; Jenni & Mauriel, 1990; Malen & Ogawa, 1988; Purkey, 1990; Strusinski, 1991). Problems included confusion that arose over the meaning of shared decision-making and its related processes, tensions concerning the exercising of power (who has power and for what purposes), inadequate communication among faculty and staff, faculty skepticism, insufficient time, and inadequate district support for shared decision-making.

David (1990) examined the basic themes involved in restructuring. He argued that in order to accommodate

change, the management of schools must be redefined, curricula and schedules redesigned, and staff development addressed. Elmore (1990) concurred with David and perceived restructuring as consisting of three dimensions:

1. Changes in the way in which teaching and learning occur, or the core technology of schooling;

2. Changes in the occupational situation of educators, including conditions of entry and licensure of teachers and administrators, school structure, conditions of work, and decision-making processes;

3. Changes in the distribution of power between schools and their clients, or in the governance structure within which the schools operate.

The above studies and others were used as a framework for the present research. The number and variety of school innovation efforts in the United States has mushroomed over the last decade. This study examined one such innovative program.

The present study examined an urban neighborhood school having a traditional education program filled by staff members who had all been teaching in a given grade for one or more years. To promote the implementation/change at the school, a consultant was hired to facilitate the many grade-level and departmental meetings that were necessary over a period of two years. During this time span, teachers were expected to become more engaged in their work, more

comfortable making decisions, and more likely to share leadership with other staff members. This also enabled the teachers to gain a better understanding of how to teach through having the support of their colleagues. These efforts became crystallized in the school's "Success for All Program," whose acceptance by, and impact on, the school's teachers is examined in the present study.

The primary goal of the Success for All program is to improve the ability of children in urban school communities to learn. This is accomplished through promoting school environments that nurture the full intellectual development of their students.

Hypotheses

Three hypotheses are advanced by this study:

Hypotheses 1: Significant differences in perceptions of school climate will be found between those teachers who did and did not support the court mandate to implement the Success for All program.

Hypotheses 2: Significant differences between perceptions of responsibilities, feedback, resources, and feelings/beliefs will be found between those teachers who did and did not support the court mandate to implement the Success for All program.

Hypotheses 3: No significant differences in teacher perceptions of school climate will be found when teachers are compared by their years of experience, gender, and grade

level taught.

The emerging trend of whole-school reform has in recent times become more pronounced in the nation's urban communities. In the past few years—according to reports, which have examined the dismal failure of public education in urban districts—the state of New Jersey has begun to approach the topic of school reform. The lack of student achievement, chronically poor test scores, and the inability of many children to read, write, or do math all support the assertion that ours is, indeed, "A Nation at Risk" (Berman & McLaughlin, 1978).

Success for All is a school wide program for students in grades pre-K through 6 that organizes resources in attempt to ensure that virtually every student will reach the third grade with adequate basic skills and will then build on this foundation throughout the elementary grades. The philosophy of Success for All is that no student will be allowed to "fall through the cracks." The main elements of the program include the following:

- tutorial instruction in the early grades, which involves one-to-one work with the students;
- a school wide curriculum which, among other things, regroups students across age lines during reading periods, so that each reading class contains students who are all at a single reading level;
- pre-school and kindergarten programs, which emphasize

language development, readiness, and self-concept;

- eight-week assessments, which determine whether students are making progress;
- a family support team in each school, which helps support parents in ensuring the success of their children;
- a program facilitator who works with teachers to help them implement the reading program, manages the eight-week assessment, assists the family support team, etc.

Statement of the Problem

This writer has examined teacher perception of school climate based upon their level of agreement and disagreement in the implementation of the Success for All Program. Focus has been placed on recently developed innovations, which have given priority to two of the SFA programs, which deals with school reform. Focus has been placed on recently developed innovations, which have given priority to two important issues: how reform is being implemented, and what kinds of relationships and communication procedures have arisen in the implementation process. In the present study, an entire school community came together specifically to create a process of reform that aimed to stimulate dialogue among staff, parents, and students in an attempt to provide them with the opportunity to direct their reform efforts.

The present study will examine the perceptions held by teachers in an urban school toward the implementation

process of a whole-school reform. In particular, this study will explore the question of whether there are significant differences in the attitude toward innovation between teachers who supported court decisions mandating reform and those teachers who did not.

Research Questions

Three research questions will be proposed:

RQ1: Are there significant differences regarding perceptions of their school's climate between those teachers who supported a court mandate to implement the Success for All program and, on the other hand, those who did not support the mandate?

RQ2: Are their significant differences between those teachers who support the court mandate and those who did not based on their perceptions of their school responsibilities, feedback, resources, feelings and beliefs.

RQ3: Are there significant differences regarding perceptions of the school climate when their experience, gender, and grade level compares teachers taught?

Significance of the Study

An increase in innovational programs that require teacher acceptance before they can be implemented has occurred in recent years. Considerable research supports the

theory that teacher acceptance of program implementation impacts the perceptions, responsibilities, resources, and beliefs of staff members involved in the innovation process (Slavin, 1994).

Ample research has shown that the Success for All (SFA) program has led to considerable success in the academic performance of students. Pogrow, (2000) revealed that the comparison of the Success For All Program found that the Success for All Program had the highest absolute scores and score gain on the TAAS, averaging across all subjects. A study in Clover Park, Washington, compared SFA to Accelerated Schools, and approach that, like Success for All, emphasizes prevention and acceleration over remediation but, unlike Success for All, does not provide specific materials or instructional strategies to a achieve its goals. In the first year of the evaluation, the Success for All and Accelerated Schools programs had similar scores on individually administered reading tests and on writing test. By second grade however, Success for All schools ere scoring slightly ahead of Accelerated Schools in reading and significantly ahead in writing. Less clear, however, is whether the attitudes of educators toward an educational innovation such as SFA correlate with their perceptions (approval, disapproval) of court decisions mandating implementation of such innovations, and whether teacher perceptions of school climate, available resources, feedback, etc., in turn impact on their support/nonsupport

for the innovations. If correlations can be found by the present study, this may help educators analyze barriers to the adoption of innovation and to facilitate the removal of these barriers.

Limitations of the Study

While the present study provides interesting information about teacher acceptance of the implementation of the Success for All program in one urban school, there are several limitations that should be noted.

One limitation is that data are only reported from those staff members who completed and returned the surveys distributed to them. While a majority of staff members did complete and return their surveys, those that did return them might have different perceptions than those who did not. It is possible, for instance, that those who returned the surveys might have a more positive attitude toward implementation than those who failed to return the surveys. In fact, this researcher believes that it is fair to assume that staff members who responded to the survey were more likely to be involved in the Success for All program as shown by their willingness to complete the survey.

An additional limitation was the size of the sample in this study. A survey using a larger sample might have yielded different results. Similarly, the fact that this survey was conducted only at one school means that the findings cannot be generalized to a larger population at

this time.

Furthermore, it is possible that staff members could have provided responses that they believed to be socially desirable rather than providing responses that truly reflected their perceptions. The fact that the study was conducted in the researcher's own school must also be pointed out. It is possible that staff members could have provided questionnaire responses that they believed might have been desired by the researcher—their principal—rather than providing responses that truly reflected their perceptions.

The Organization of the Study

The present study is organized into five chapters. Chapter One includes the problem statement, the background of the problem, definitions of terms appearing in the study, the hypotheses, and the significance, limitations, and organization of the study.

Chapter Two consists of a literature review, which examines research pertaining to the acceptance of innovation programs, the implementation of conflict resolution, teacher perceptions of change and other issues.

Chapter Three describes the research methodology. It outlines the content of the study, a discussion of the subjects, the research instrument, procedures, data analysis, analysis of the Teacher Focused Activities Questionnaire, and the hypotheses.

Chapter Four presents the findings of the study, and

contains an analysis of the data, a discussion of the findings, and a final summation of the relationships of the variables.

Chapter Five contains a summation, conclusion, and discussion of the study. It also proposes recommendations, along with implications for future research.
A Bibliography and Appendices follow Chapter Five.

Definition of Terms

Adoption - The process through which an innovation has been accepted.

Diffusion - The process by which an innovation is communicated through certain channels over time among the members of a social system.

Heterophily. The degree to which two or more interacting individuals differ in attributes such as belief and social status.

Homophily. The degree to which two or more interacting individuals are similar in attributes such as belief and social status.

Implementation - This occurs when an individual (or other decision-making unit) puts an innovation into practice.

Innovation - An idea, practice, or object that is perceived as new by an individual or other unit of adoption.

Linear - Something that proceeds on a line or that is direct.

Linear Regression Analysis - An analysis that indicates

that there appears to be a positive and significant relationship.

Perception - Having an understanding of what is being assumed.

Restructuring - A means of empowering staff to improve the effectiveness of schools.

Whole-School Reform - A movement to restructure the educational process and its delivery of services.

CHAPTER II:
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Few things are more difficult to plan, more dubious of success, or more dangerous to manage than the creation of something new. Nearly 500 years ago, Niccolo Machiavelli observed that whenever one's enemies have the ability to attack an innovator, they will do so with the passion of partisans, while the innovator's supporters are likely to come to his defense only sluggishly. The result is that both the innovator and his defenders are vulnerable (Machiavelli, 1996; reprint).

This literature review examines the ways in which teacher belief systems and perceptions impact upon their acceptability of new educational ideas. Drawing on and reviewing related research and literature pertaining to the rate of acceptability of an innovation in its early stages, Chapter II also focuses on the definition of acceptance and implementation as it impacts the early stages of innovation adoption.

The History of Diffusion

Rogers and Shoemaker (1971) stated that by the 1960s diffusion research had emerged as a single, integrated body

of concepts and generalizations. Such research, which started in several independent intellectual enclaves, continues today as an ongoing process.

Each of the disciplinary cliques of diffusion researchers initially studied only one kind of innovation. For instance, rural sociologists investigated the diffusion of agricultural innovations among farmers, while educational researchers studied the spread of new teaching ideas among school personnel. Researchers noted that despite the distinctiveness of the various studies, each group of investigators uncovered remarkably similar findings. One example of this is research that found that the diffusion of an innovation generally follows an S-shaped curve over time, and that the rate of diffusion generally depends on the socioeconomic status of the adopters (Rogers & Shoemaker, 1971).

Rogers (1961) conducted a study, which noted the lack of distinctive results in diffusion research and argued for the greater interchange of ideas among the various diffusion research traditions. He defined a research tradition as a series of investigations focused on a single topic in which successive studies are influenced by preceding inquiries. Rogers viewed each research tradition as an invisible "college" of researchers, or a network of scholars who were spatially dispersed but closely interconnected through the exchange of research findings and other scientific information.

By the mid-1960s the formerly impermeable boundaries between the various diffusion research traditions began to break down. Rogers and Shoemaker (1971) computed an index of cross-tradition citations for each diffusion publication available as of 1968; this index represented the number of cross-disciplinary citations in the footnotes and bibliography of each empirical diffusion publication. While the number hovered at less than 1.0 throughout the 1940s, 1950s, and 1960s, between the years 1965 and 1968 it suddenly more than doubled to 2.0.

The trend toward a more unified cross-disciplinary viewpoint in diffusion research continues today; every diffusion scholar is fully aware of the parallel methodologies and results inherent in the other traditions. In essence, all of the diffusion research traditions have now converged (at least intellectually) toward a single, large invisible "college" in spite of the numerous different disciplines, which are conducting research in diffusion studies. However, from a research perspective, this merging of diffusion approaches has been a mixed blessing. Diffusion studies now display a kind of bland sameness, as they pursue a small number of research issues using rather stereotyped approaches.

The Beginning of Diffusion Research in Europe

Gabriel Tarde, one of the forefathers of sociology and social psychology, was a French lawyer and judge at the turn

of the last century who kept an analytical eye on trends in his society that grew out of legal cases coming before his court. Tarde drew certain generalizations about the diffusion of innovations. From these generalizations he formulated what he called the "laws of imitation," which became the title of his influential book. The goal of his scholarly observations was:

> to learn why, given one hundred different innovations conceived at the same time—innovations in the form of Words, in mythological ideas, in industrial processes, etc.—ten will spread about while ninety will be forgotten (Tarde, 1903, 1969, p. 41).

Gabriel Tarde was far ahead of his time as regards his thinking about diffusion. Although he pursued slightly different concepts than those employed in his later writings (for instance, what he initially referred to as "imitation" later became known as the "adoption of an innovation"), this sociological pioneer explored several of the main research issues that were more quantitatively broached by diffusion scholars in later decades: among other observations, Tarde identified the adoption or rejection of innovations as a crucial outcome variable in diffusion research (1903, 1969).

Tarde also observed that the rate of adoption of a new idea usually followed ans-shaped curve over time. Perhaps more astutely, Tarde recognized that the take-off in the S-curve of adoption begins to occur when the opinion leaders in a system adopt a new idea. In this way, diffusion network

thinking was involved in Tarde's explanation of the S-curve, even though he did not use such present day terminology as "networks," "homophily" (the degree to which two or more interacting individuals are similar in attributes such as belief, social status, etc.), or "heterophily" (the degree to which interacting individuals differ in these attributes). Tarde's key word, imitation, implies that an individual learns about an innovation by copying another's adoption behavior (Tarde, 1903, 1969).

As one of his most fundamental laws of imitation, Tarde (1903, 1969) proposed that the more similar an innovation is to ideas that have already been accepted, the more likely it is that the innovation will be adopted (today, we say that the perceived compatibility of an innovation is related to its rate of adoption). For Tarde, the diffusion of innovations was a basic and fundamental explanation of human behavior change: "invention and imitation are, as we know, the elementary social acts" (Tarde, 1903, 1969, p. 39).

While Tarde was the most prominent European forefather of the diffusion field, his creative insights were not immediately developed in empirical studies of diffusion. It remained for later scholars to further develop Tarde's insights, a task which was undertaken after World War II.

Subsequent approaches to change were introduced in the 1940s and 1950s, but given the political nature of the times (the Cold War, the Korean conflict, the launching of Sputnik, etc.), there was little sympathy for an approach to

school improvement that might be viewed as "rocking the boat" in any way, including approaches that depended on human hypothesis-testing or ones which emphasized gradual adaptation rather than speedy adoption (Miller & Lieberman, 1988). Instead, in the first few decades of the post-World War II period, the emphasis was placed on pragmatic analysis and practical applications, many of which were often put forth by researchers and theoreticians far removed from schools and classrooms.

By the late 1960s and early 1970s there was a growing sense of urgency about the problems inherent in the "professionalism of reform." Sarason (1982) concluded that professional reformers were doomed to failure primarily because of their detachment from actual practice; Sarason also wrote that theories that refuse to change as practice changes will inevitably lead to confusion and disillusionment.

Opportunism and Problem-Solving

The enhancement of school improvement efforts, however, is not simply a matter of moving theorists and their theories closer to actual classroom practices. Such a response does not work because it makes an assumption about why innovations are adopted in the first place. This assumption, which holds that school improvement efforts are selected primarily because students will benefit from them, turns out to be highly inaccurate; less than half of

improvement adoptions are attributable to problem-solving ventures (Sarason, 1982). As has become clear by all of the "steady work" of the past decade, good intentions alone do not suffice to bring about lasting change.

Elmore and McLaughlin (1988) identified a sameness to the way in which change is pursued. They concluded that the *'raisons d'etre'* of reform, including the current groundswell toward excellence and quality reforms, all have predictable patterns. First comes an upsurge of public concern, followed by a broad-scale dissemination of "best practice," abetted by policy, professional networks, or both.

Second, paragons and models of "best practice" are given priority, and the pressure for reform from both political and professional sources trails off. The result is that traces of the models of "best practice" remain in textbooks, in teacher education, in local structures and in state law. At a certain point, a new upsurge of public concern starts the process all over again (Elmore & McLaughlin, 1988).

The Missing Elements

No reform process proceeds in a totally linear and smooth way. One salient question, which often arises, is "what is missing?" Why do educators often persist in repeating cycles of reform/failure/reform whose pitfalls or shortcomings should have been obvious long ago? In part, the

answers are found in how change is typically planned and managed. Several findings from the NETWORK study have significant implications for initiating and managing change.

The NETWORK study (1982) found that early and sustained focus on continuation activities is as critical to the success of an innovation as is the implementation process. The NETWORK study also measured time spans related to various innovations, and concluded that the more time and attention that is devoted to the implementation phase, the more likely the program was to be fully implemented. Moreover, the study found that full implementation could occur in as little as 18 months if teachers' concerns are addressed and if their needs for ongoing support and training are met. Finally, the NETWORK research indicated that the more ambitious and challenging the innovation, the more likely it is to be implemented and sustained (NETWORK, 1982).

Fullan (1988) argued that real change, whether imposed or voluntarily pursued, results in a new personal and collective experience characterized by ambivalence and uncertainty. If the change works out as planned, it can result in a sense of mastery, accomplishment, and professional growth. In a similar vein, Hall and Loucks (1978) referred to the stages of the developmental pattern as: (1) concerns and feelings experienced by teachers and others affected by change and (2) their use of the innovation.

Tinzmann et al. (1990) observed that change is technically simple and socially complex. Fundamental reform, of course, is not really simple, but at some point visions of learning and new conceptions of schooling will be translated into written plans, procedures, timetables, and resource lists. Tinzmann and colleagues supported the fundamental viewpoint that school improvement occurs first within the school through the involvement and leadership of the principal, teachers, and parents. The authors argued that change is not an isolated effort, but that it requires collaboration among these three groups aimed at developing a common vision for a school, a vision which can then be shared with others.

Sizer's (1972) reform model known as the Coalition of Essential Schools focused on the clarification of organizational beliefs and values. All of the schools in the coalition shared a common set of beliefs, yet each developed its own specific plan. Schools participating in the National Educational Association's Mastery in Learning Project create a knowledge base for planning and change via their use of planning instruments and their work with project staff. However, Rhodes (1988) argued that although change at the school level is important, *permanent* change requires a focus on district level concerns. Critical in this regard is the need to examine and, if necessary, subsequently alter the infrastructure that determines relationships between individual schools and their district.

Reigeluth (1987) spoke of a quantum leap to a comprehensively different educational system. This different system is gradually and systematically implemented, beginning with a prototype school from an ideal educational system. Early changes may involve building or remodeling a facility, selecting new instructional materials, or training personnel. Similarly, Goodlad's (1984) eight-year study of 1000 classrooms in 38 schools examined this form of comprehensive change. His conclusions led him to advocate major, comprehensive improvements in schools rather than incremental, piecemeal change.

The Types of and Reasons for Restructuring

The possible components of restructuring are numerous and varied. According to Murphy and Beck (1995), the components comprise school-based management, increased consumer choice, teacher empowerment, and teaching for understanding. Restructuring can also comprise curriculum and instruction redesign to promote higher order thinking; the decentralization of authority, and decision-making; more diverse and differentiated roles for teachers; and a broadened system of accountability (Hargreaves, 1994).

Throughout the United States and in numerous other countries, a restructuring of schools has taken place at all levels of the educational system. According to Hallinan (1995), most school reform plans can be characterized as efforts to restructure schools. Restructuring can occur at

any level of an institution or organization. In most cases, the objective of restructuring has been to change, improve, and reform schools in an attempt to achieve higher efficiency and to maximize the benefits from educational spending. This has become even more necessary as governments attempt to cut costs in spite of the recent educational expansion and globalization of knowledge information and skills.

In the broader historical context, restructuring is not a new phenomenon. On the one hand, its heritage lies in the larger reform movement that characterized education in the twentieth century (Murphy, 1993). Restructuring, according to Pasow et al. (1993), is part of the larger fabric of reform, one woven from cyclical waves of improvement efforts that have washed over education approximately every decade for the last 100 years or so.

Research on school improvement (Lieberman, 1986; Baldridge & Deal, 1975; Clark, Lotto, & Astuto, 1984) has identified a number of factors and conditions that may affect institutionalization of an innovation in educational organizations. Based on interview data garnered from principals, it appears that at least half of schools did not have strong school support systems. The above studies have reaffirmed the finding that support for school improvement must come from both the school unit and the district's central administration.

Russell et al. (1997) conducted a five-year study which examined the implementation of interdisciplinary teaching teams in mid-level settings; the study, moreover, examined teachers' attitudes toward team practices. Russell and colleagues found that although the attitude of teachers fluctuated, the level of agreement between teachers never fell below 72%. Russell et al. wrote that teachers appeared to be attracted to interdisciplinary teaming and seemed to retain their positive views as they gained experience with such teaming.

Howe and Bell (1998) described the implementation of interdisciplinary middle school environmental science curriculum units. Howe and Bell noted that factors such as strong principal support, structural components (such as teachers having the same students), a common planning time, and a strong, intact team were associated with success.

Allinder and Oats (1997) studied 21 special education teachers. Twelve of these teachers had a high acceptance of curriculum-based innovation, while the other nine had a low acceptance. Allinder and Oats found that the members of these two groups differed on two of five implementation measures. The authors also found that there was a significant difference between the two teacher groups as regards the rate of advancement that had been achieved by their mathematics students.

Useem (1997) assessed nine professional development initiatives undertaken by the Philadelphia Education Fund.

Useem's objective was to gain insight into why such initiatives generally achieved only partial implementation at the grade school level. Useem concluded that entrenched policies and practices, non-supportive principals, faculty team disruptions, and union work rules which affected teacher transfers and faculty work time were all barriers to full implementation.

Shapley and Pinto (1997) described the revised portfolio assessment process that was implemented for Chapter 1 students in Dallas, Texas, and reviewed the literature on teacher adjustment to innovation. (Chapter 1 funds, now known as Title I funds, refers to money the federal government has given school districts to aide them in providing supplementary services to low-achieving students). The authors also described in their study the teachers' perspectives on the benefits and difficulties they encountered in implementing portfolio assessment in primary grades. Shapley and Pinto found that teachers passed through five stages of concerns, but generally reported a high level of personal satisfaction with portfolio assessment.

Carr (1997), in his teacher and principal interviews and surveys, examined how Toronto (Canada) principals have responded to equity-based education initiatives. Carr described barriers to implementation in secondary schools and offered strategies for helping principals become more effective in this capacity. Carr also concluded that the principal's character and capacity to lead, together with

the given school culture, will often influence the outcome of equity-based initiatives.

Smith (1997) identified factors that distinguished fast-starter schools from slow-starter ones during the first year of the Memphis (Tennessee) Restructuring Initiative, which followed a "cell division" implementation model. Smith's conclusions supported strong administrative leadership to enhance start-up time, a restructuring model matching schools' current values and practices, curricula aligned with state assessment, and contextual/demographic variables.

Ross (1997) reported on the first-year global evaluations of eight design implementations in Memphis. Ross's study was based on syntheses of data from multiple sources. Common strengths included revitalized schools and initiation of new school organizations and teaching strategies. Ross found, however, that salient concerns included the need for more focused training, more teaching collaboration time, and strategies for integrating curricular and learning activities with skills assessed by state-mandated exams.

George (1996) examined interventions and strategies used by Chapter 1 Program Improvement schools to improve academic programs and services. Site visits to 15 California elementary and middle schools resulted in the identification of several successful common elements: strong leadership, quality core curriculum, school autonomy, district support,

and parent and community involvement. Negative effects, which gave rise to what is termed Limited Program Improvement, resulted mainly from high principal turnover.

Speck (1996) argued that the change process depends on the acceptance, adaptation, and institutionalization of change by individuals, the school organization, and the community. Speck's study presents a Change Process Model that helps principals visualize the steps needed to achieve meaningful change. The model encompasses a school's vision, its stakeholder groups, the necessary skills that are involved, and the new techniques and resources. Speck also commented on the need to take into account the relevant political, managerial, and monitoring considerations.

Alexander (1996) examined two arguments regarding the question of why educational innovations come and go with such regularity. One argument states that there is a paucity of knowledge about the innovations; this lack of knowledge leads to the proposing of superficial solutions and implementations. The second argument holds that it is the inability of educators to tap into the roots of the educational innovations that results in the reinvention or recycling of old movements under new labels.

Inbar (1993) writes that all planning approaches require a result that must be assessed. Thus, analyzed results of the planning/implementation cycle's success (or lack thereof) can strongly influence the planning process itself. Inbar identified the components that determine

success and failure thresholds, develop a success/failure framework, and apply the framework to analyze basic planning climates, and explore directions for further discussion.

Rollow and Bryk (1993) discussed a case study, which focused on 12 elementary schools affected by the Chicago School Reform Act. (The researchers' emphasis was placed on examining two schools). The researchers focused on local contexts and features of school communities that advanced or impeded change. Rollow et al. found that the data demonstrated the importance of neighborhood environments, school leadership, and the complexities of applying expertise to the tasks at hand.

Drake (1992) examined the first year of a three-year change initiative in which a holistic curriculum was implemented in a kindergarten through grade-eight school in Ontario, Canada. Drake reported on the success of the implementation and its continued use as part of the school's overall philosophy.

Semmel and Gerber (1990) criticized programs that implement the Regular Education Initiative for their relatively simplistic approaches to the instructional problems that are sometimes created by diversity. The researcher argued that programs such as "Success for All" and teacher consultation programs do not adequately consider what happens to those students and teachers who do not succeed under the Regular Education Initiative.

Gersten (1986) reviewed multilevel analyses of a large-scale educational improvement effort that was conducted in seven urban schools over a two-year period. Consistently moderate to high relationships were found between observed levels of model implementation and classroom achievement gains in reading. Gersten concluded that major improvement in inner-city schools is possible.

Larger-Scale Projects

Afflerbach (1996) examined the perspectives of school personnel regarding the perceived barriers to effective implementation of a statewide program concerned with curriculum and instructional innovations. Afflerbach conducted interviews with personnel from five schools and districts. These interviews found that school personnel had generally positive attitudes concerning the shift from their existing curriculum and assessment programs to the newer mandated state program.

As Afflerbach found, I also found that interview data from teachers, principals, and curriculum coordinators demonstrated that adherence to the mandated statewide program was not without considerable challenges. I found that school personnel reported that the implementation of the Success for All program and intended school change was made more difficult by an absence of correspondence between existing instruction and performance assessment and, on the other hand, the instruction and performance assessment which

was mandated. This situation was further complicated by a lack of alignment between teacher practices and beliefs with those explicated in the statewide program. Additional difficulties arose from lack of resources, the performance assessment materials and procedures themselves, and insufficient communication from the state related to the mandated program.

Afflerbach noted that the data suggested that overcoming barriers to implementation of the statewide program require a systematic approach that bridges communication barriers between those people involved in the curriculum, instruction, and the performance assessment materials and procedures.

In 1992 the South Eastern Regional Vision for Education (SERVE) undertook a three-year research and development effort in support of four schools and two school districts in the southeastern United States, which were implementing Total Quality Management (TQM) processes (South Eastern Regional Vision for Education, 1995). SERVE's report describes the experiences and perceptions of the participating educators. Chapter 3 of the report examines the experiences of each of the pilot sites and offers a framework for systemic reform, although it is concluded that there is no one correct way to implement TQM.

SERVE's Chapter 4 presented the findings of an independent evaluation of the pilot sites' implementation of TQM strategies. Data derived from focus groups and

individual interviews suggested that they keys to a total quality school include (1) a committed and supportive leader; (2) a faculty that is open to change; (3) ample time set aside for training; (4) the inclusion of all faculty in an orientation; and (5) the recognition that TQM requires a long-term commitment. It should be noted, however, that these factors are probably demanded for all change efforts.

Luze (1997) examined the activities and accomplishments of Project Lift (Looking at Intervention Factors with Teachers). Project Lift assessed the relationships among classroom intervention acceptability, integrity, and effectiveness. Two studies were conducted as part of Project LIFT. The first involved observing interventions implemented in 10 Iowa elementary classroom settings. The second study surveyed 350 elementary teachers in 11 states; the teachers were given a project-development questionnaire which focused on their experiences and perceptions of the interventions they have implemented with their students.

Luze reported that findings from both studies indicated that teachers tended to receive assistance when developing an intervention, but then often implemented the intervention by themselves. The teachers' individualized intervention plans rarely described specific steps to be completed. Luze noted that the Project Lift experience found a discrepancy in the fact that the teachers responding to the survey (in the second study) indicated more use of formal efforts to maintain intervention integrity than did teachers in the

observation study (the first study).

Wolfson (1996) investigated the acceptance of innovation and change as it related to a specific education change or prior learning assessment (PLA). Wolfson's study was conducted at the University College of the Fraser Valley (UCFV) in British Columbia (Canada). The study explored the barriers that face students who wanted to have experimental and workplace learning count toward their credentials at UCFV.

Wolfson reported that a content analysis of all internal and provincial documents relating to PLA was used to identify a series of issues and concerns that were explored both qualitatively and quantitatively. A survey of all UCFV faculty and administrators explored attitudes toward, as well as actual experience with, prior learning assessment. An in-depth focus interview was conducted with those who attempted to gain recognition for prior learning. Uses of case studies and triangulation presented a more complete description of the situation and a more thorough understanding of the forces acting to both inhibit and promote change. Integration of content analysis, survey research, and in-depth interviews served as a basis for a set of recommendations to UCFV that, it was hoped, would increase acceptability and use of PLA.

The Havelock and Zlotolow Study

Havelock and Zlotolow (1995) examined how successful change happens and how change agents can organize their work to make it happen. Their study was designed to help change agents in various organizational settings understand the dimensions of the problem and the larger social situation. Havelock and Zlotolow provided guidelines for change plans, and discussed how educators can know what to look for and what to avoid in a team, in clients, and in oneself. The authors also provided guidelines so that educators can make correct choices in innovation, can know about potential resources as well as how to gain access to them, and can learn about which strategies have produced success for others, and why.

Following an introduction which explains basic principles and definitions, Part I of the Havelock and Zlotolow study presents cases of four change agents and the innovations they introduced. The change agents played a wide range of roles: student, teacher, and administrator, outside consultant. Each case is then analyzed in terms of Havelock and Zlotolow's change model.

Part II of the Havelock and Zlotolow study is made up of seven chapters, each of which represents one stage in the change process: (1) caring: establishing the need for action; (2) relating: building relationships with and among clients; (3) examining: understanding the problem; (4) acquiring: seeking and finding relevant resources; (5)

trying: committing to solutions; (6) extending: gaining deeper and wider acceptance; and (7) gaining technology education.

Havelock and Zlotolow then presented some explanations for the overall lack of acceptance of change. For one thing, technology education advocates have often failed to demonstrate any relative advantage of a specific curriculum change to the teachers who had been asked to implement that change.

Secondly, Havelock and Zlotolow argued that when the technology education curricula have been *externally* developed, resistance among educators has tended to be greater. Havelock and Zlotolow also opined that technology education change agents often ignored the feelings of industrial technology teachers by failing to provide in-service training. Finally, the authors argued that the previous change experience of the industrial technology teachers might not have been positive.

Noting that 69% of surveyed teachers failed to accept a new program, Havelock and Zlotolow recommended that teachers' acceptance of technology education be enhanced through taking into account their opinions and by providing in-service education for them.

The Acceptance of Technological Innovation

Kershaw (1996) stated that focusing on effective change in post-secondary organizations should not be about

introducing new technology. Rather, it should be about encouraging individuals to change to way in which they do things and the way in which they think about their roles in their organizations. This includes a strategy of using practical and educational technology, developing a plan, creating suitable organizational structures, providing sufficient training and support, and promoting technology use for various purposes. Furthermore, Kershaw wrote that institutions must be prepared to allocate scarce resources to support staff and students who do in fact avail themselves of new technology. Without this crucial willingness to allocate scarce resources, Kershaw argued, there can be no effective change.

Studies on the Implementation of Conflict Resolution

Given the reality that resistance among teachers or other staff members frequently hampers the implementation of educational innovations, how to resolve this resistance becomes a crucial question.

Gajria and Salend (1996) carried out a study entitled "Treatment Acceptability: A Critical Dimension for Overcoming Teacher Resistance to Implementing Adaptations for Mainstream Students." Gajria and Salend reviewed the literature pertaining to teachers' perceptions of the acceptability of behavior management interventions, instructional modifications, and testing accommodations. Treatment acceptability was found to be a critical factor

that may influence the extent to which teachers implement effective classroom adaptations for mainstreamed students. Consequently, Gajria and Salend offered suggestions for overcoming teachers' resistance to the use of classroom adaptations with mainstreamed students.

Trachtman et al. (1991) tested theories of adoption of innovations via the introduction of an experimental school-centered and neighborhood-oriented information and communication system in a small midwestern city. Data was obtained in three waves of telephone interviews over an eight-month period involving 249 families who had accepted the system on a no-cost-to-user trial basis.

Trachtman et al. (1991) noted that widely accepted models of adoption behavior had predicted general acceptance of this innovation: there was to be a long no-cost trial period offering a wide variety of information services, the community involved was computer-sophisticated, the system's operation was relatively simple, and a large proportion of respondents had positive attitudes toward home computers.

Yet, reported Trachtman and colleagues, the system failed to take hold. Some 80 percent of those using the system rejected it when asked to decide on its permanent adoption. Trachtman et al. reported that the reasons for this unanticipated outcome included the fact that many participants perceived the hardware and software as being too simple, along with the fact that the system was plagued by a high breakdown rate. Participants also reported that

they perceived the system as being almost totally redundant despite the variety of services it offered. Finally, Trachtman et al. noted that there was no institutional mandate to employ the system, as there might have been in a more hierarchical organization; such an organization can reward use of an innovation and impose costs for failing to employ it, thereby facilitating its implementation.

Trachtman et al. also noted that questionnaires returned by 21 teachers from the participating school suggested a serious compatibility problem at work: teachers failed to use the system because it was not universally available to all of their students—thus violating their democratic and egalitarian views of how a public school system should function. Without teachers encouraging use of the system, its utility to both students and their parents was greatly diminished. Trachtman et al. concluded that specific characteristics of an innovation, the population to which it is introduced, and the general social environment are likely to play more complex and subtle roles in adoption behavior than is usually assumed by most generally accepted diffusion and adoption models.

Manginelli (1998) examined and interpreted the ways in which individuals experience the implementation of conflict resolution and peer mediation programs at an elementary school. The program's intent was to inform educational reformers and organizational leaders about educational and organizational change. This goal was to be accomplished by

presenting richly textured personal information about the participants who were involved in the change process.

Using a qualitative approach based on interviews, observations, and informal conversations, Manginelli's study gave voice to individual accounts involving the key players implementing change. Manginelli reported on interviews conducted with administrators, teachers charged with implementation of the change, grade-level teachers who carried out the change, and support staff members—all of whom discussed the conflict resolution and peer mediation processes. Through analysis, Manginelli found that the key players often felt that lack of time, poor communication, difficult interrelationships, and weak leadership all adversely impacted upon the success of the implementation. Some of the teachers, however, did not view these factors as detrimental to the implementation.

Manginelli concluded that when individuals are asked to make a change, most will weigh the potential benefits versus the perceived costs and risks. As an implementation continues, individuals will assess the value of their participation. If the implementers do not perceive that the value satisfaction of remaining involved with an innovation is greater than the costs and risks, they are not likely to continue their involvement. Recognition of this dynamic, Manginelli wrote, is critical to explaining the reason that many innovators do not succeed in their organizations. When individuals believe that engaging in behavior to impel an

implementation forward will serve their values of self-esteem, pride, safety, respect and/or power, only then will programs be brought to fruition (Manginelli, 1998).

Cartas (1998) conducted a study with the objective of determining the extent of technology use in regular education classrooms, as well as establishing the relationships among factors that promote the use of technology. Fourteen schools employing 426 teachers were asked to complete the San Diego Technology Implementation Survey. One hundred thirty-seven teachers in thirteen schools, or 28.8 percent of the survey population, returned the completed surveys within the prescribed time frame. A Cronbach Alpha was conducted to test the reliability of the 52-item scale used.

A linear regression analysis indicated that there appeared to be a positive and significant relationship between teacher use of technology tools and general, local, and external factors of innovation adoption. Further analysis by Cartas indicated that general factors were the single greatest predictor of teacher use of technology tools. Potential adopters were more likely to implement innovations if they had favorable perceptions regarding the general factors that are related to the necessity of the innovation, its complexity, compatibility, and relative advantage.

Ridder (1997) examined the question of whether the internal characteristics of schools were perceived

differently in those schools in which teachers taught applied academic courses and those schools in which teachers did not teach such courses. All teachers had attended applied academic training courses approved by the Missouri Department of Education.

Ridder also investigated if there were other teacher or school characteristics that might influence the acceptance and implementation of instruction in applied academics. Four characteristics of individual teachers and schools that were statistically significant were: (1) the educational level of the teacher; (2) the number of years the teacher had taught; (3) the number of grade levels in the building; and (4) the percentage of recommended equipment available to the teachers.

Ridder drew the following conclusions: (1) teacher perceptions of the internal characteristics of their schools have little relationship to whether they taught an applied academics course after receiving training; (2) teachers with fewer graduate hours and who are in their early years of teaching are more likely to teach applied academic courses; (3) the more grade levels a school has and the greater the percentage of needed equipment that is available, the more likely it is that the teachers are qualified to teach applied academic courses.

Wisard (1998) investigated how the beliefs, perceptions, decision-making, and behavior (defined as the teachers' sense of efficacy) of classroom instructors

influenced the meaning of their experiences during the implementation of a conflict resolution program. A secondary focus of Wisard's year-long study was placed on examining how urban classroom teachers used skills acquired in a conflict resolution program to facilitate the resolution of interpersonal conflicts among students.

Wisard's study was conducted in two elementary schools and one middle school in an urban area in northeastern Ohio and actively involved one second grade teacher, one fifth grade teacher, and one seventh grade teacher. The principals of the three schools played only a minor role. Five methods of assessment were used: interviews with each teacher were conducted three times during the school year, three classroom observations were made of each teacher, one interview was conducted with each principal, reflective journal entries were written by each of the teachers, and a final focus group interview was conducted at the end of the study.

Wisard employed qualitative research using the case study method to examine the data. When extrapolated to a larger population, analysis indicated that most teachers have had particular background experiences at schools which have shaped their perceptions about handling interpersonal conflicts. Furthermore, knowledge and implementation of innovations created change in the teacher's approach to classroom management. Finally, Wisard noted that certain conditions in the school setting will transfer to classrooms

and serve to encourage or hinder the use of the given innovation.

Nickey (1997) examined teacher satisfaction toward the implementation of a major structural change within a given school. Identifying the role of the teacher as an important change agent in the implementation of school-wide change, the relationship between teacher satisfaction toward that change, relative to the characteristics of the individual teacher, was examined in order to determine the usefulness of considering those teacher characteristics for planning pre-implementation activities.

Nickey discussed his findings in terms of the importance to educational planners of identifying and attending to the readiness conditions at a particular location before implementing a major change. The efficacy of considering the characteristics of individual instructors when making decisions about the nature of readiness conditions prior to the provision of pre-implementation activities was discussed by Nickey in terms of the findings and the major decision-making and implementation models. Contraindications of applying a generic approach to planning and implementation were presented and served to emphasize the importance of recognizing the unique nature of a school when planning a major change. Nickey's findings indicated the presence of statistically significant relationships between a teacher's overall satisfactions with the experienced change and, on the other hand, the age, gender,

grade level taught, and participation in a previous planned change.

Goldsmith (1995) examined the effectiveness of a science innovation called the "Science Education Reform Initiative in the Elementary School" (SERIES) program. The SERIES program was begun in 1993 and is an ongoing elementary science program within the Jefferson County School System in Birmingham, Alabama. Two key components of the system's SERIES program were teacher-training and a science curriculum based on hands-on activity-based units. Goldsmith's investigation included teachers who had participated in the training program, Science Cam, from one to three years. Goldsmith focused on the participating teachers' development of high levels of concern, their perceived level of expertise with the science modules, their utilization of the science module program, and the general strengths and weaknesses of the SERIES program.

Goldsmith found that teachers did in fact develop higher levels of concern with continued staff development. Other findings disclosed that teachers who experienced continued staff development reported higher levels of expertise in using the science modules. The strengths of the program including having a positive impact on students, effective provisioning of materials, fostering peer training, and having a positive impact on the teachers. Identified weaknesses were related to materials management, scheduling, time constraints, and certain aspects of

modeling with students.

Carney (1994) examined the process of change employed by a rural Kentucky elementary school, which had been identified as having successfully implemented the state's primary program. The main purpose of Carney's study was to analyze how the school implemented the primary program based on characteristics of effective change. Carney conducted 23 formal interviews, 29 document reviews, several observations in primary classrooms, and attended a number of meetings concerned with primary program implementation.

Carney found that all 10-change characteristics had an impact on the implementation process in the successful primary school; however, since some characteristics had more impact than others, the findings were categorized into three levels. Level One characteristics were identified as "collaborative leadership," which played the key role in the implementation of the primary program. Level Two characteristics, which were seen to be training, risk-taking, teamwork and collaboration, communication and information, and evaluation and revision, had a secondary influence on program implementation. Level Three characteristics included having a firm vision for the program, support systems, and planning time.

Carney noted that the school's principal contributed to successful primary program implementation and that the principal employed effective change characteristics during the implementation process. A final conclusion mentioned by

Carney was that the school was change-oriented even before the primary program was introduced, and continued to be so oriented throughout the implementation process.

Teacher Perceptions of Change

Weaver (1997) examined the "innovation propensity" of teachers in Kentucky. In 1991, the Kentucky legislature mandated a massive educational reform effort known as the Kentucky Education Reform Act (KERA). One of KERA's components was a non-graded program for students aged five through eight. Since elementary school teachers were the key implementers of the primary program, Weaver's study examined data about teacher attitudes toward certain critical attributes and teachers' self-reported implementation of the attributes. Weaver's study was patterned after a study by Person (1985), who had previously studied the adaptiveness of teachers.

The sample in Weaver's study included 786 teachers from Northern Kentucky, each of whom was given a survey. Four hundred seventy-one usable surveys were returned (61 percent return rate) and were used in Weaver's data analysis. Of these respondents, 10 percent were innovators and 82 percent were early adopters, which indicated that the majority of respondents were open to innovation and that they would be likely to implement the attributes.

In responding to Weaver's survey, the respondents indicated very positive attitudes about developmentally

appropriate practices, professional teamwork, authentic assessment, parent involvement, and continuous progress. When asked which attribute was easiest to implement, more than 61 percent chose developmentally appropriate practices. Thirty-nine percent responded that multi-age/multi-ability grouping was the most difficult attribute to implement.

Henry (1995) examined teachers' beliefs pertaining to the mathematics curriculum, their teaching practices, and their attitudes toward learning. Henry further investigated the ways in which these beliefs and attitudes interacted with other factors in the implementation of a set of innovative curriculum materials. Data was collected from a set of six structured interviews, teachers' journals, and field notes from classroom observation. Data was analyzed using a constructivist framework to determine how various teachers constructed implicit and explicit rationales and processes for implementing curricula in relation to their own personal beliefs and capabilities.

Henry found that teachers' beliefs about the interaction between the innovation and their teaching of mathematics had strong effects on their implementation and on the way in which they interpreted other factors in their teaching environment. For instance, one teacher, "Carol," utilized the innovation most completely, due mainly to three factors: (1) a preexisting epistemology and pedagogy which were consistent with those underlying the innovation; (2) a distinct need for the innovation in her role as team leader;

and (3) a supportive research relationship.

On the other hand, another teacher, "Beth," felt a need for the innovation in her teaching, but did not hold the antecedent beliefs or experience support necessary to enable her to implement the innovation fully. Other teachers in the team approached the innovation as "one more thing" to do on top of everything else, and did not feel a need to pursue it, even after initially positive experiences for the teachers and students.

Those involved in school reform may draw several conclusions from Henry's study. Reformers might examine the relationship(s) between teacher expectations and the potentialities of a given innovation. They should also be aware of the dynamics between teachers and research team members, and take steps to ensure that assignments are adjusted for each situation, with support allocated accordingly. School personnel must re-examine the relationship between curriculum, testing, ability grouping, and innovation in order to better motivate and empower teachers in their curricular decisions.

Grady (1995) examined teachers' perceptions regarding barriers to, and mechanisms for, successful innovation implementation. Grady found that teachers' perceptions play a significant role in the implementation of pedagogic innovation in early childhood education.

Grady found that individual change at a very complex level is possible if a support system is in place that

promotes growth and allows for flexibility. This finding reinforces the need for administrative support in the innovation process, along with the notions that the innovation must be thoroughly understood and that teachers must receive feedback once they are in the process of implementing the innovation.

Hope (1995) conducted a study which examined the initiation and implementation of computer technology in the educational environment of an elementary school and assessed its impact on teachers.

Hope developed a conceptual framework to promote computer technology and to monitor and interpret the results. Elements of the framework included five guidelines of the Innovation-Focused strategy (Fullan, 1988), interventions of the Change Facilitator Strategy (Hall & Hord, 1987), and the Concerns-Based Adoption Model (Hord et al., 1987). The inquiry was comprised of several research questions, including the concerns that teachers had about computer technology; whether there were factors in the school environment that promoted the diffusion and use of computer technology by teachers; and what the perceived barriers were that impeded acceptance and use of computer technology by teachers.

Hope concluded that fear of technology can be alleviated with an implementation strategy that empowers teachers and accepts and works within their point of view. An additional conclusion was that the complexity of an

innovation affects the rate at which teachers master and use that innovation. Finally, Hope concluded that configuring the innovation into its component parts facilitates its successful implementation and alerts the change facilitator to technical assistance needs.

Lavery (1993) found that little had been written about teachers' experiences in implementing self-initiated innovations. Lavery identified factors and forces which influenced teachers in terms of making their practice consistent with their self-initiated, changed thinking about the nature of learning and teaching. Data analysis revealed both personal and workplace factors of importance.

Lavery identified two important personal factors: First was a transformed perspective, i.e., changed ideas about the nature of learning and teaching motivated teachers to transform their practice. Second, the role of mentors and collaborating colleagues was often significant in influencing teachers' implementation efforts. Mentors included traditional mentors, such as senior or more knowledgeable individuals to whom the teacher turned for guidance.

Important workplace factors identified by Lavery included institutional policies and opportunities for implementing a changed perspective; other institutional policies and procedures; supervisors; colleagues; and students.

Lavery also found that teachers' perceptions that their

implementation efforts would be welcomed and encouraged was an important and necessary factor in their making that effort. Organizations' policies and procedures helped, hindered, or prevented teachers' implementation efforts. Encouragement and support from immediate supervisors and work colleagues encouraged teachers to continue and increase their efforts. Finally, Lavery found that the responses of students were of importance to the teachers; when student responses were negative regarding the teachers' methods, teachers often made efforts to overcome their weaknesses.

Kendrick (1993) examined the problems associated with the adoption of an educational innovation. Kendrick's research suggested that contextual factors play a role in determining the success or failure of innovation. While there are some factors identified that seem to influence the implementation of new programs, Kendrick noted that little information has been available indicating how these factors may impact the innovation.

In general, Kendrick wrote, the particular innovation studied had relatively little impact on contextual factors. However, there were some identifiable contextual factors which were impacted by the innovation. These included factors related to teachers, students, programs, and school organizations, and they were impacted by the innovation in two relatively different ways.

The innovation had a positive effect on attitudes toward staff development. Administrators recognized the

importance of materials management in the implementation of new programs. Secondly, student attitudes weighed heavily in the instructional decision-making of teachers; student interest and enjoyment of the program often became a criterion for decision-making in the larger context of the classroom. Kendrick's study indicated the potential for an innovation to promote interaction and positive collegial relationships among teachers.

Bradley (1992) attempted to gain a better understanding of program implementation at the local school level. She also tried to gain further insight into teachers' receptivity to change. The main focus of her study were the events and factors that teachers attributed to changes in their behavior during the implementation. The participants in Bradley's study were 15 female elementary school teachers in Massachusetts, each having between eight and 20 years of teaching experience.

Bradley's research design employed descriptive statistics, qualitative interviews, and an in-service design factors questionnaire. Concerns Based Adoption Model (CBAM) instruments found that 94 percent (14) of the subjects were identified at Level IVA—Routine Use of an Innovation, or beyond. This finding concurs with the teacher change literature, which has found that teachers require from 12 to 18 months of using an innovation before they become routine users of that innovation.

CHAPTER III:
METHODOLOGY

Context of the Present Study

Research examining the impact of teacher acceptance of the Success for All (SFA) program implementation has mainly focused on individual school acceptance. Research examining the impact of teacher acceptance of the Success for all program implementation has mainly focused on individual school acceptance. The examination of SFA implementation process conducted by A Nation Study (1996) revealed the following important factor which has impacted the acceptance of the Success for All Program where it has been implemented The examination of the SFA implementation process conducted by A Nation Study (1996) a following very important factor, which has impacted the acceptance of the Success for All program where it has been implemented.

"A Nation Study"

A Nation Study (1996) identified the trend of educational innovation over the long run as being inadequate. Most innovations adopted on a large scale were

never adequately evaluated to begin with (Slavin, 1994), and even among the small number that have been successfully evaluated few innovations have been able to maintain themselves in schools over an extended time period. Others that may have achieved some degree of success in a given school could not be replicated in another school.

This finding echoes the experiences of this researcher. This researcher can, from his own experience, identify numerous programs that have failed due to inadequate implementation measures. This researcher has noted that, most often, innovations that have been enthusiastically embraced and even found to be effective in a school setting have later been dropped, sometimes to be replaced by less effective innovations, and sometimes being replaced by the previously existing status quo. This finding is certainly true when one examines the innovation dynamics in an urban school district.

It is obvious that the boom-to-bust cycles traversed by educational innovations are all too similar. If one were to examine any field of endeavor ruled by fashion and faddism (such as art, music, design, or haute couture), rather than by empirical evidence (such as is true in the fields of physics, medicine, and engineering), it becomes apparent that novelty is prized; however, it also becomes evident that no trend or fad lasts for many years.

Moreover, it is very clear that innovations to be implemented are often brought in or championed by one or a

small number of staff members, and it is equally clear that the new program may quickly disappear when the staff member(s) departs. Further, if an innovation is to be implemented, extraordinary efforts on the part of staff and administrators is required, and over time these individuals may simply burn out. Changes in the superintendent, school boards, and other key district-level staff, as well as changes in district, state, or national policies may also imperil or doom implementation of a particular idea or an innovation.

With this in mind, the purpose of the present study was to examine the impact of teacher acceptance on the implementation of the Success for All program in one urban school in New Jersey. In particular, the present study called on teachers to respond to a comprehensive series of questions pertaining to the operation of the SFA Program at their urban school. The study took into account such factors as staff years of experience, prior and current involvement in an innovative program, gender, grade level and school climate.

Subjects

Staff members in levels Kindergarten through Six at the urban school who had participated in the SFA awareness sessions/training program comprised the subject population. Staff teaching experience ranged from several first-year teachers to those having in excess of thirty years of

experience in the particular urban school or in the larger urban school district in which the school is situated.

Staff members' participation was strictly voluntary. Careful consideration was given to preserving the anonymity of the participants, as well as to assuring the participants that their decision to participate or not participate in the questionnaire was purely optional. (Staff members were given a cover letter from the researcher specifying an assurance of anonymity and also stating that if they wished to refrain from participation their choice would be respected).

Instrument

In order to examine the impact of teacher acceptance on the implementation of the Success for All program in the urban school, this researcher developed a "Teacher-Focused Activities Questionnaire" (See Appendix C). This questionnaire is a modified version of the "Survey of Perceptions of Teaching Personnel With Regard to the Levels of Implementation in Site-Based Managed Schools," originally developed by Kenneth Haycock and modified by Dr. Judith Moran (See Appendix A & D) (1991). The questionnaire was made available in the Spanish language for those staff members of the school's Bilingual Department who preferred reading the questions in their native language. (However, all school personnel were able to read and comprehend the English version of the survey).

The questionnaire asked the participants to respond to a number of statements pertaining to the school's efforts with regard to implementing the Success for All program. In general, the questionnaire instructed the participants to indicate their level of agreement with a series of statements along a five-point Likert-scale continuum, with possible responses ranging from "Strongly Agree" (5) to "Strongly Disagree" (1), with a mid-point (3) representing "Uncertain."

Procedures

Prior to the distribution of the "formal" questionnaire, an initial pre-questionnaire had been distributed to a pilot group of five staff members in early November 2000, at the urban school; these staff members were selected to review the pre-questionnaire based on their experiences as master teachers in the fields of Language Arts/Reading. The purpose of administering the pre-questionnaire was to enable the researcher to gain feedback evaluating the questionnaire's clarity of thought, grammar, and spelling, as well as to review the questionnaire with respect to its content relative to questions and information in accordance with the implementation and acceptance of the Success for All program. Members of the pre-questionnaire "proofing" group were asked to recommend changes where applicable.

This pre-questionnaire was designed solely for proofing, and the proofing group members were instructed not to respond to any of the survey's questions. Based on the feedback of the proofing group, the instrument was carefully reviewed and, where necessary, revised preparatory to a final distribution of the formal questionnaire to the larger group of subjects (N=84).

The finalized questionnaire was then distributed to all staff in grades Kindergarten through Six who had participated in the SFA awareness sessions/training program. Each questionnaire was accompanied by a cover letter which explained the nature of the study, and which guaranteed anonymity to those choosing to participate. These were distributed to the participants and those who chose to participate were asked to return the questionnaires within twenty-five school days to a box under lock and key (See Appendices B and C). The researcher expected to meet the central theorem of a 25% response rate; however, as it turned out, the actual response rate was a complete 84-90%, as all 84 staff members returned the completed questionnaire.

Data Analysis

The data analysis begins with a presentation of the basic descriptive statistics pertaining to demographic variables, which describe the subjects who participated in this study. Frequency distributions are presented as to the

subjects' years of experience as a teacher, whether the subjects have been previously involved in an innovative educational program implementation in the past, whether they are still involved in an innovative program, their gender, and the grade level at which they are currently teaching. The mean years of experience as a teacher are also presented.

Analysis of the Teacher Focused Activities Questionnaire

Section A of the Teacher Focused Activities Questionnaire (TFAQ) consists of 20 questions. This section consists of 4 scales, as follows:

- 1. Responsibilities: Questions 1, 9, and 15;
- 2. Feedback: Questions 4, 5, 6, 7, 13, and 16;
- 3. Resources: Questions 3, 8, 11, 12, 14, 17, 18, and 19;
- 4. Feelings/Beliefs: Questions 2, 10, and 20.

Section A of the TFAQ measures the subjects' level of agreement or disagreement with questions pertaining to their responsibilities, feedback, resources, and feelings/beliefs. Question 20 from the Feelings/Beliefs scale was used to as an independent variable and analysis of the hypothesis. Question 20 measured the subjects' level of support for the court mandate to implement the Success For All program. Subjects who strongly agreed/agreed, supported the court mandate. Subjects who strongly disagreed/disagreed did not

support the court mandate. Frequency distributions as well as means and standard deviations are presented for each question, and means and standard deviations are presented for each scale. The scale scores are created by summing the responses to the questions for each scale, then dividing by the number of questions in the scale. A narrative description of the results of these analyses is presented.

Section B of the TFAQ consists of 62 questions, which ask for the subjects' opinions pertaining to several aspects of the school climate. This section consists of eight scales, as follows:

- 1. Principal involvement: Questions 25, 26, 27, 31, 32, 39, 54, 55, 56, and 58;
- 2. Parent Involvement: Questions 2, 4, 9, 11, 16, and 17;
- 3. School Communication/Cooperation: Questions 8, 20, 22, 28, 29, 36, 44, and 45;
- 4. Concern for Students: Questions 5, 10, 14, 33, and 37;
- 5. Physical/Emotional Environment: Questions 6, 7, 12, 13, 35, 38, 41, 43, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, and 62;
- 6. Teacher Commitment/Motivation: Questions 1, 3, 15, 24, 30, and 34;
- 7. Resources for Learning: Questions 46, 47, 53,57, and 59;
- 8. Teacher Support: Questions 18, 19, 21, 23, 40, 42, 60, and 61.

Scores for each subset scale were created, and frequency distributions as well as means and standard deviations are presented for each scale and each question in the scale. A narrative description is provided for all noteworthy findings, highlighting questions and scales where the means indicate a significantly high or low level of agreement.

Finally, comparisons are conducted with analysis of variance (ANOVA) to determine whether the means on the opinion scales differ by subjects' years of experience as a teacher, by their gender, and by the grade levels they teach. Moreover, ANOVA was used to compare teachers who supported the court mandate to implement the Success for All Models with those who did not support this mandate, as shown by the opinion scales.

Hypotheses and Analysis

Three hypotheses are advanced:

H1: Significant differences in perceptions of school climate will be found between those teachers who did and did not support the court mandate to implement the Success for All program.

This hypothesis is examined through the creation of Acceptance Groups based on subject responses to Question 20 in Section A of the TFAQ. Those subjects who score 4 and 5 will represent the "Agree group," those who score 3 represent the "Uncertain group," and those who score 1 and 2

are the "Disagree group." Analysis of variance is conducted to compare these three groups on the eight scales that constitute Section B of the TFAQ.

H2: Significant differences with perceptions of responsibilities, feedback, resources, and feelings/beliefs will be found between those teachers who did and did not support the court mandate to implement the Success for All program.

Using the Acceptance Groups (agree, uncertain, disagree) indicated in the above discussion of Hypothesis 1, analysis of variance will be employed to compare the groups with respect to the mean scores for responsibilities, feedback, resources, and feelings/beliefs which constitute Section A of the TFAQ.

H3: No significant differences in teacher perceptions of school climate will be found when teachers are compared by their years of experience, gender, and grade level taught.

At-test is used to compare the male and female subjects along the eight scales that constitute Section B of the questionnaire. Analysis of variance is used to compare teachers grouped by years of experience and grade level taught for the eight scales that constitutes Section B of the questionnaire.

CHAPTER IV:
RESULTS

The purpose of this chapter is to present the results of the data obtained through the administration of the Teacher Focused Activities Questionnaire (TFAQ). This chapter begins with a presentation of basic descriptive statistics pertaining to demographic variables and the questionnaire responses. This is followed by the results of the hypotheses testing.

Demographic Data

Eighty-four subjects participated in the current study. A frequency distribution of the subjects' gender is presented in Table 1, below. Sixty-two subjects (73.8%) provided information pertinent to their gender. Of these respondents, 80.6% were females and 19.4% were males. Twenty-two subjects (26.2%) did not respond to this question.

TABLE 1:
FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION FOR GENDER

Gender	N	Percent
Female	50	80.6
Male	12	19.4
Total	62	100.0

Note: 22 subjects (26.2%) did not respond to this question.

Table 2 below presents a frequency distribution pertaining to grade level taught. Sixty-two subjects responded to this question. The respondents included three kindergarten teachers (4.8% of the total participants), four first-grade teachers (6.5%), and four third-grade teachers (6.5%). Other grades were represented by larger numbers of teachers, including second grade (having eight subjects or 12.9%), fourth-grade (having ten subjects or 16.1%), and teachers who taught more than one grade (33 subjects or 53.2% of the total).

TABLE 2:
FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION FOR GRADE

Grade	n	Percent
Kindergarten	3	4.8
1st	4	6.5
2nd	8	12.9
3rd	4	6.5
4th	10	16.1
Other	33	53.2
Total	62	100.0

Note: 22 subjects (26.2%) did not respond to this question.

Table 3 below presents a frequency distribution pertaining to the subjects' years of teaching experience. Sixty subjects responded to this question. Teaching experience ranged from one year (seven subjects, or 11.7% of the total) to 38 years (two subjects, or 3.3%). Almost one-third of the subjects responding to this question had three or fewer years of experience (19 subjects, or 31.7%), 51.7% of the subjects had ten or fewer years of experience, and 21.7% of the subjects had 20 or more years of teaching experience. The mean number of years of experience was 12.01 years with a standard deviation of 9.74 years.

TABLE 3:
FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION FOR YEARS OF EXPERIENCE AS A TEACHER.

Years Experience	n	Percent	Cumulative Percent
1	7	11.7	11.7
2	10	16.7	28.3
3	2	3.3	31.7
5	4	6.7	38.3
6	2	3.3	41.7
7	2	3.3	45.0
10	4	6.7	51.7
11	2	3.3	55.0
14	2	3.3	58.3
16	1	1.7	60.0
17	2	3.3	63.3
18	2	3.3	66.7
19	2	3.3	70.0
20	5	8.3	78.3
21	3	5.0	83.3
22	3	5.0	83.3
23	1	1.7	90.0
25	4	6.7	96.7
38	2	3.3	100.0
Total	60	100.0	

Note: 24 subjects (28.6%) did not respond to this question.

Table 4 below presents a frequency distribution of prior involvement in innovative educational programs. Sixty-eight subjects responded to this question. More than 40% of the respondents (29, or 42.6%) reported prior involvement in innovative educational programs.

TABLE 4:
FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION FOR PRIOR INVOLVEMENT IN INNOVATIVE EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Innovative Programs in Past	n	Percent
Yes	29	42.6
No	39	57.4
Total	68	100.0

Note: 16 subjects (19.0%) did not respond to this Question.

Table 5 below presents a frequency distribution pertaining to current involvement in innovative educational programs. Fifty-seven subjects responded to this question. One-third of the respondents (19 subjects, or 33.3%) reported having current involvement in an innovative educational program

TABLE 5:
FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION FOR CURRENT INVOLVEMENT IN AN INNOVATIVE EDUCATION PROGRAM

Currently in an Innovative Program	n	Percent
Yes	19	33.3
No	38	66.7
Total	57	100.0

Note: 27 subjects (32.1%) did not respond to this question.

Table 6 below presents the response frequencies to each question listed on the Teacher Focused Activities Questionnaire—Section A. The scales in this section consisted of questions that measured teacher perceptions of issues related to their responsibilities, the feedback they received, resources, and their personal feelings and beliefs. Further, Question 20 of TFAQ—Section A evaluated the subjects' level of agreement or disagreement with the court mandate. The scale mean (**in bold**) and the mean for each individual question is also provided in Table 6. An interesting observation pertaining to this data is that although the full range of ratings was used for each question (that is, strongly agree to strongly disagree), the mean for every scale and the mean for almost every question (18 of 20) indicate that, on average, the teachers had positive perceptions.

Table 6:
Teacher Focused Activities Questionnaire - Section A

	Strongly Disagree		Disagree		Uncertain		Agree		Strongly Agree		Mean	S. D.
Scale	N	%	n	%	n	%	N	%	N	%		
RESP											**3.77**	**.74**
1	4	4.8	6	7.1	12	14.3	52	61.9	10	11.9	3.69	.94
9	4	4.8	9	10.7	18	21.4	40	47.6	13	15.5	3.58	1.03
15	2	2.4	4	4.8	6	7.1	47	56.0	25	29.8	4.05	.88
FDBK												
4	2	2.4	2	2.4	26	31.0	41	48.8	9	10.7	**3.60**	**.83**
5	4	4.8	4	4.8	13	15.5	43	51.2	20	23.8	3.84	.99
6	2	2.4	8	9.5	27	32.1	33	39.3	14	16.7	3.58	.95
7	2	2.4	4	4.8	14	16.7	45	53.6	19	22.6	3.89	.89
13	3	3.6	6	7.1	22	26.2	40	47.6	13	15.5	2.78	1.33
16			6	7.1	19	22.6	47	56.0	12	14.3	2.94	.92
RSCS											**3.62**	**.67**
3	2	2.4	2	2.4	26	31.0	41	48.8	13	15.5		
8	4	4.8	11	13.1	21	25.0	40	47.6	8	9.5		
11	6	7.1	12	14.3	29	34.5	36	42.9	1	1.2	3.16	.94
12	3	3.6	8	9.5	16	19.0	44	52.4	13	15.5	3.66	.97
14	4	4.8	4	4.8	15	17.9	46	54.8	15	17.9	3.76	.96
17	2	2.4	14	16.7	20	23.8	40	47.6	8	9.5	3.45	.96
18	2	2.4	4	4.8	16	19.0	45	53.6	17	20.2	3.84	.88
19	2	2.4	4	4.8	10	11.9	50	59.5	18	21.4	3.92	.86
F/B												
2	4	4.8	2	2.4	4	4.8	39	46.4	35	41.7	**3.97**	**.87**
10*			8	9.5	21	25.0	44	52.4	11	13.1	3.69	.82
20	2	2.4	8	9.5	20	23.8	32	38.1	22	26.2	3.76	1.02

The responses to Section B of the Teacher Focused Activities Questionnaire pertain to the teachers' perceptions of issues related to the school climate. These responses are presented in Table 7 below. Section B of the TFAQ included scales that measure the teachers' perceptions on issues such as principal involvement, parent involvement, school communication and cooperation, concern for students, the physical and emotional environment, resources for learning, and teaching support. As with Section A of the TFAQ, teacher responses to the questions in Section B were, on average, positive. The mean for every scale indicated positive perceptions, and the mean for most questions (31 out of 42 questions) presented positive perceptions.

TABLE 7:
TEACHER FOCUSED ACTIVITIES QUESTIONNAIRE - SECTION B

	Strongly Disagree		Disagree		Uncertain		Agree		Strongly Agree		Mean	S.D.
Scale	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	N	%		
Principal Involvement											3.75	.60
25	6	7.1	8	9.5	11	13.1	44	52.4	15	17.9	3.64	1.10
26	2	2.4	4	4.8	8	9.5	50	59.5	20	23.8	3.97	.86
27			2	2.4	12	14.3	46	54.8	24	28.6	4.09	.72
31	2	2.4	8	9.5	26	31.0	35	41.7	13	15.5	3.58	.94
32	8	9.5	15	17.9	29	34.5	29	34.5	3	3.6	3.04	1.02
39	4	4.8			23	27.4	50	59.5	7	8.3	3.66	.82
54			4	4.8	12	14.3	47	56.0	21	25.0	4.01	.76
55	2	2.4	8	9.5	9	10.7	56	66.7	9	10.7	3.73	.86
56	6	7.1			19	22.6	39	46.4	20	23.8	3.79	1.03
58			2	2.4	16	19.0	48	57.1	18	21.4	3.97	.71
Parent Involvement											3.38	.69
2	4	4.8	19	22.6	10	11.9	45	53.6	6	7.1	3.35	1.06
4	2	2.4	6	7.1	21	25.0	43	51.2	12	14.3	3.67	.89
9	2	2.4	6	7.1	12	14.3	45	53.6	19	22.6	3.86	.92
11			8	9.5	23	27.4	40	47.6	13	15.5	3.69	.84
16	8	9.5	13	15.5	40	47.6	22	26.2	1	12	2.94	92
17	13	15.5	16	19.0	37	44.0	16	19.0	2	2.4	2.73	1.01
School Community Cooperation											3.82	.70
8	2	2.4	4	4.8	18	21.4	37	44.0	23	27.4	3.89	.94
20	4	4.8	2	2.4	3	3.6	66	78.6	9	10.7	3.88	.81
22	4	4.8	6	7.1	9	10.7	40	47.6	25	28.9	3.90	1.05
28	6	7.1	4	4.8	17	20.2	50	59.5	7	8.3	3.57	.97
29	2	2.4	4	4.8	11	13.1	51	60.7	16	19.0	3.89	.85
36	2	2.4	6	7.1	14	16.7	45	53.6	17	20.2	3.82	.92
45	8	9.5	10	11.9	12	14.3	45	53.6	9	10.7	3.44	1.13
Resources for Learning											3.25	1.09
46	8	9.5	25	29.8	3	3.6	39	46.4	9	10.7	3.19	1.24
47	10	11.9	14	16.7	8	9.5	44	52.4	8	9.5	3.30	1.2

												1
53*	6	7.1	8	9.5	6	7.1	32	38.1	32	38.1	3.90	1.2 1
57	4	4.8	2	2.4	17	20.2	49	58.3	12	14.3	3.75	.90
59	4	4.8	2	2.4	21	25.0	45	53.6	12	14.3	3.70	.91
Teacher Support											**3.84**	**.81**
18	12	14.3	21	25.0	20	23.8	31	36.9			2.83	1.0 8
19	4	4.8	14	16.7	10	11.9	51	60.7	5	6.0	3.46	.99
21	2	2.4	4	4.8	6	7.1	51	60.7	21	25.0	4.01	.85
23	10	11.9	12	14.3	10	11.9	41	48.8	11	13.1	3.36	1.2 2
40	21	25.0	25	29.8	10	11.9	16	19.0	12	14.3	2.67	1.4 0
42	10	11.9	4	4.8	12	14.3	50	59.5	8	9.5	3.50	1.1 2
60	8	9.5	8	9.5	19	22.6	47	56.0	2	2.4	3.32	1.0 1
61	8	9.5			19	22.6	51	60.7	6	7.1	3.55	.98
Concern for Student											**4.03**	**3.3 1**
5	2	2.4	2	2.4	7	8.3	44	52.4	29	34.5	4.14	.85
10	2	2.4	8	9.5	6	7.1	44	52.4	24	28.6	3.95	.98
14	2	2.4	4	4.8	8	9.5	45	53.6	25	29.8	4.03	.89
33	2	2.4			8	9.5	48	57.1	26	31.0	4.14	.77
37	2	2.4	6	7.1	10	11.9	47	56.0	19	22.6	3.89	.91
Physical/ Emotional Environment											**3.23**	**.64**
7	2	2.4	6	7.1	27	32.1	30	35.7	19	22.6	3.69	.98
12	8	9.5	15	17.9	14	16.7	38	45.2	9	10.7	3.29	1.1 6
13	18	21.4	24	28.6	7	8.3	28	33.3	7	8.3	2.78	1.3 3
35	8	9.5	10	11.9	13	15.5	40	47.6	13	15.5	3.47	1.1 7
38	10	11.9	15	17.9	12	14.3	40	47.6	7	8.3	3.22	1.1 9
41*	4	4.8	5	6.0	15	17.9	44	52.4	16	19.0	3.75	.99
43	2	2.4			6	7.1	63	75.0	13	15.5	4.01	.66
48	4	4.8	4	4.8	11	13.1	47	56.0	18	21.4	3.84	.97
49	24	28.6	30	35.7	8	9.5	12	14.3	10	11.9	2.45	1.3 5
50*	17	20.2	22	26.2	8	9.5	25	29.8	12	14.3	2.91	1.3 9
51	18	21.4	27	32.1	6	7.1	27	32.1	6	7.1	2.71	1.3 1
52*	9	10.7	30	35.7	6	7.1	27	32.1	12	14.3	3.03	1.3 0
62	8	9.5	25	29.8	21	25.0	28	33.3	2	2.4	2.89	1.0 5
Teacher Commitment/											**3.75**	**.63**

Motivation												
1	4	4.8	10	11.9	11	13.1	37	44.0	22	26.2	3.75	1.11
3			6	7.1	12	14.3	40	47.6	26	31.0	4.02	.86
15			6	7.1	11	13.1	38	45.2	29	34.5	4.07	.87
16	8	9.5	13	15.5	40	47.6	22	26.2	1	1.2	2.94	.92
24			2	2.4	13	15.5	52	61.9	17	20.2	4.00	.67
30	2	2.4	2	2.4	19	22.6	41	48.8	20	23.8	3.89	.87
34	4	4.8	6	7.1	25	29.8	32	38.1	17	20.2	3.61	1.04

The means and standard deviations on the Teacher Focused Activities Questionnaire scales are presented in Table 8 below. These means and standard deviations are subcategorized by the subject's responses to question 20 on section A regarding their level of agreement or disagreement with the court mandate.

TABLE 8:
MEANS & STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR TEACHER FOCUSED ACTIVITIES QUESTIONNAIRE BY GROUP

	Not in support of the mandate		Uncertain		In support of the mandate	
Scale	**Mean**	**SD**	**Mean**	**SD**	**Mean**	**SD**
Section A						
Responsibilities	2.86	1.26	3.51	.57	4.04	.46
Feedback	2.86	.84	3.48	.62	3.97	.58
Resources	2.80	.70	3.37	.54	3.86	.55
Feelings/Beliefs	2.60	1.71	4.35	.67	4.40	.56
Section B						
Principal Involvement	3.08	.55	3.63	.57	3.92	.53
Parent Involvement	3.00	.54	2.99	.71	3.60	.61
School Communication/ Coordination	2.93	.99	3.63	.48	4.06	.55
Concern for Students	3.60	.88	3.91	.54	4.15	.64
Physical/Emotion Environment	2.90	.21	2.99	.31	3.38	.49
TCM	2.94	.75	3.67	.28	3.93	.58
Resources for Learning	1.50	.57	3.27	.93	3.56	.90
Teacher Support	3.12	.81	3.48	.94	4.10	.61

Analysis of Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1: No significant differences in perceptions of responsibilities, feedback, resources, and feelings/beliefs will be found between those teachers who did and did not support the court mandate to implement the Success for All program.

Hypothesis 2: No significant differences in perceptions of school climate will be found between those teachers who did and did not support the court mandate to implement the Success for All program.

Analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to analyze these hypotheses. Prior to conducting these analyses, the data were reviewed for conformance to ANOVA assumptions, including normality and homogeneity of variance. Frequency distributions were reviewed to determine normality, which was satisfactory for all scales. Homogeneity of variance was evaluated with the Levine statistic. As a result, two different types of post hoc comparisons were used to pinpoint actual group differences. For scales in which the homogeneity of variance assumption was satisfactory, Scheffe comparisons were used. The Tamhane T2 comparisons were used for significant ANOVAs in which homogeneity was violated (SPSS, 1999), as this comparison does not require equal variances to conduct a valid test.

TABLE 9:
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE RESULTS FOR TEACHER FOCUSED ACTIVITIES QUESTIONNAIRE SCALES-SECTION A

Scale	Source of Variation	Sum Of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Significance
Responsibility	Between Groups	13.46	2	6.73	16.84	.001
	Within Groups	32.38	81	.40		
	Total	45.85	83			
Feedback	Between Groups	11.83	2	5.91	15.02	.001
	Within Groups	31.91	81	.39		
	Total	43.75	83			
Resources	Between Groups	11.24	2	5.62	17.23	.001
	Within Groups	26.42	81	.32		
	Total	37.67	83			
Feelings and Beliefs	Between Groups	28.33	2	14.16	22.07	.001
	Within Groups	51.98	81	.64		
	Total	80.32	83			

The analysis of variance results for the Teacher Focused Activities Questionnaire (TFAQ)-Section A is presented in Table 9, above. The following significant differences were found between the strongly agree/agree, uncertain, and strongly disagree/disagree groups:

Responsibility. The ANOVA results indicate that significant mean differences were indeed found [F(2,81)=16.84, p=.001] between the groups based on their level of agreement or disagreement with the court mandate (strongly disagree/disagree, uncertain, strongly agree/agree). Tamhane T2 post hoc comparisons were conducted to identify specific group differences. The post hoc comparisons indicate that the responsibility scale mean of 4.04 for the strongly agree/agree group was significantly higher than the means of 3.51 for the uncertain group and 2.86 for the strongly disagree/agree group. These results indicate that subjects who agreed with the court mandate had a more favorable view of their responsibilities than subjects who were uncertain or did not agree with the court mandate. No significant mean differences were found between the uncertain and disagree groups on this scale.

Feedback. The ANOVA results indicate that significant mean differences were found [F(2,81)=22.07, p=.001] between the groups based on their level of agreement or disagreement with the court mandate (strongly disagree/disagree,

uncertain, strongly agree/agree). Tamhane pos hoc comparisons were conducted to identify specific group differences. The post hoc comparisons indicate that the feedback scale mean of 2.60 for the strongly disagree/disagree group was significantly lower than the means of 4.35 for the uncertain group and 4.40 for the strongly agree/agree group. These results indicate that subjects who agreed with the court mandate or were uncertain, had a more favorable view of their feedback than did the subjects who uncertain or who disagreed with the court mandate. Further, subjects who were uncertain about the court mandate had a more favorable view of their feedback than did subjects who disagreed with the court mandate.

Resources. The ANOVA results indicate that significant mean differences were found [$F(2,81)=17.23$, $p=.001$] between the groups based on their level of agreement or disagreement with the court mandate (strongly disagree/disagree, uncertain, strongly agree/agree). Scheffe post hoc comparisons were conducted to identify specific group differences. The post hoc comparisons indicate that the resources scale mean of 3.86 for the strongly agree/agree group was significantly higher than the means of 3.37 for the uncertain group. Furthermore, the mean of 3.37 for the uncertain group was significantly higher than the mean of 2.80 for the strongly disagree/disagree group. These findings suggest that subjects who agreed with the court

mandate had a more favorable view of their resources than did those subjects who were uncertain about or disagreed with the court mandate. As well, subjects who were uncertain about the mandate had a more favorable view of their resources than subjects who disagreed with the court mandate.

Feelings/Beliefs. The ANOVA results indicate that significant mean differences were found [$F(2,81)=16.84$, $p=.001$] between the groups based on their level of agreement or disagreement with the court mandate (strongly disagree/disagree, uncertain, strongly agree/agree). Scheffe post hoc comparisons were conducted to identify specific group differences. The post hoc comparisons suggest that the Feelings/Beliefs scale mean of 4.40 for the strongly agree/agree group was significantly higher than the means of 3.67 for the uncertain group and 2.20 for the strongly disagree/disagree group. Likewise, the mean of 3.67 for the uncertain group was significantly higher than the mean of 2.20 for the strongly disagree/disagree group. These results indicate that subjects who agreed with the court mandate had a more favorable view of their feelings/beliefs than did subjects who were uncertain or disagreed with the mandate. And the subjects who were uncertain about the court mandate had a more favorable view of their feelings/beliefs than subjects who disagreed with the mandate.

TABLE 10:
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE RESULTS FOR TEACHER FOCUSED ACTIVITIES QUESTIONNAIRE SCALES-SECTION B

Scale	Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Significance
Principal Involvement	Between Groups	6.41	2	3.20	10.73	.001
	Within Groups	24.19	81	.29		
	Total	30.60	83			
Parent Involvement	Between Groups	177.46	2	88.73	8.86	.001
	Within Groups	810.95	81	10.01		
	Total	988.41	83			
School Community/ Cooperation	Between Groups	11.79	2	5.89	16.03	.001
	Within Groups	29.79	81	.36		
	Total	41.58	83			
Concern for Students	Between Groups	3.03	2	1.51	3.50	.003
	Within Groups	35.10	81	.43		
	Total	38.14	83			
Physical & Emotional Environment	Between Groups	4.89	2	2.44	6.58	.002
	Within Groups	30.14	81	.37		
	Total	35.04	83			
Teacher Commitment Motivation	Between Groups	8.49	2	4.24	14.02	.001
	Within Groups	24.52	81	.30		
	Total	33.01	83			
Resources for Learning	Between Groups	.98	2	17.99	23.22	.001
	Within Groups	62.76	81	.77		
	Total	98.75	83			
Teacher Support	Between Groups	11.49	2	5.74	10.82	.001
	Within Groups	43.03	81	.53		
	Total	54.52	83			

The analysis of variance results for the TFAQ—Section B is presented in Table 10, above. The following significant differences were found between the strongly disagree/disagree, uncertain, and strongly agree/agree groups:

Principal Involvement. The ANOVA results indicate that significant mean differences were found [F(2,81)=10.73, p.=001] between the groups based on their level of agreement or disagreement with the court mandate (strongly disagree/disagree, uncertain, strongly agree/agree). Scheffe post hoc comparisons were made to identify specific group differences. The post hoc comparisons indicate that the Principal Involvement scale mean of 3.92 for the strongly agree/agree group was significantly higher than the mean of 3.08 for the strongly disagree/disagree group. As well, the mean of 3.63 for the uncertain group was significantly higher than the mean of 3.08 for the strongly disagree/disagree group. These results indicate that the subjects who agreed with the court mandate had a more favorable view of Principal Involvement than subjects who disagreed with the mandate. Subjects who were uncertain about the court mandate had a more favorable view of their Principal Involvement than subjects who disagreed with the court mandate.

Parent Involvement. The ANOVA results indicate that significant mean differences were found [F(2,81)=8.86, p=.001] between the groups based on their level of agreement

or disagreement with the court mandate (strongly disagree/disagree, uncertain, strongly agree/agree). Scheffe post hoc comparisons were conducted to identify specific group differences. The post hoc comparisons indicate that the parent involvement mean of 3.60 for the strongly agree/agree group was significantly higher than the means of 2.99 for the uncertain group and 3.00 for the strongly disagree/disagree group. These results suggest that the subjects who agreed with the court mandate held a more favorable view of their Feelings/Beliefs than did those subjects who were uncertain or who disagreed with the mandate.

School Communication/Cooperation. The ANOVA results indicate that significant mean differences were found [$F(2,81)=16.03$, $p=.001$] between the groups based on their level of agreement or disagreement with the court mandate (strongly disagree/disagree, uncertain, strongly agree/agree). Scheffe post hoc comparisons were conducted to identify specific group differences. These post hoc comparisons indicated that the school communication and cooperation scale mean of 4.06 for the strongly agree/agree group was significantly higher than the means of 3.63 for the uncertain group and 2.93 for the strongly disagree/agree group. In addition, the mean of 3.63 for the uncertain group was significantly higher than the mean of 2.93 for the strongly disagree/disagree group. These results indicate that subjects who agreed with the court mandate had a more

favorable view of school communication and cooperation than subjects who were uncertain or disagreed with the mandate. And those subjects who were uncertain about the court mandate had a more favorable view of school communication and cooperation than did the subjects who disagreed with the mandate.

Concern for Students. The ANOVA results indicate that significant mean differences were found [F(2,81)=3.50, p=.003] between the groups based on their level of agreement or disagreement with the court mandate (strongly disagree/disagree, uncertain, strongly agree/agree). Scheffe post hoc comparisons were conducted to identify specific group differences. The post hoc comparisons indicate that the concern for students scale mean of 4.15 for the strongly agree/agree group was significantly higher than the mean of 3.60 for the strongly disagree/disagree group. These results indicate that subjects who agreed with the court mandate had a more favorable view of concern for students those subjects who disagreed with the mandate.

Physical/Emotional Environment. The ANOVA results indicate that significant mean differences were found [F(2,81)=6.58, p=.001] between the groups based on their level of agreement or disagreement with the court mandate (strongly disagree/disagree, uncertain, strongly agree/agree). Tamhane T2 post hoc comparisons were conducted to identify specific group differences. The post hoc comparisons indicate that the physical and emotional

environment scale mean of 3.38 for the strongly agree/agree group was significantly higher than the means of 2.98 for the uncertain group and 2.90 for the strongly disagree/disagree group. These results indicate that subjects who agreed with the court mandate had a more favorable view of the physical and emotional environment than subjects who were uncertain or who disagreed with the mandate.

Teacher Commitment/Motivation(TCM). The ANOVA results indicate that significant mean differences were found [$F(2,81)=14.02$, $p=.001$] between the groups based on their level of agreement or disagreement with the court mandate (strongly disagree/disagree, uncertain, strongly agree/agree). Tamhane T2 post hoc comparisons were conducted to identify specific group differences. The post hoc comparisons indicate that the TCM scale mean of 3.93 for the strongly agree/agree group was significantly higher than the means of 3.67 for the uncertain group and 2.94 for the strongly disagree/disagree group. The mean of 3.67 for the uncertain group was significantly higher than the mean of 2.94 for the strongly disagree/disagree group. These results indicate that subjects who agreed with the court mandate had a more favorable view of TCM than subjects who were uncertain or who disagreed with the mandate. And subjects who were uncertain about the court mandate, in turn, had a more favorable view of TCM than subjects who disagreed with the mandate.

Resources for Learning. The ANOVA results indicate that significant mean differences were found [F(2,81)=23.22, p=.001] between the groups based on their level of agreement or disagreement with the court mandate (strongly disagree/disagree, uncertain, strongly agree/agree). Scheffe post hoc comparisons were conducted to identify specific group differences. The post hoc comparisons indicate that the feelings/beliefs scale mean of 3.56 for the strongly agree/agree group was significantly higher than the mean of 1.50 for the strongly disagree/disagree group. The mean of 3.27 for the uncertain group was significantly higher than the mean of 1.50 for the strongly disagree/disagree group. These results indicate that subjects who agreed with the court mandate had a more favorable view of resources for learning than subjects who disagreed with the mandate. And subjects who were uncertain about the court mandate had a more favorable view of resources for learning than subjects who disagreed with the mandate.

Teacher Support. The ANOVA results indicate that significant mean differences were found [F(2,81)=10.82, p=.001] between the groups based on their level of agreement or disagreement with the court mandate (strongly disagree/disagree, uncertain, strongly agree/agree). Tamhane T2 post hoc comparisons were conducted to identify specific group differences. The post hoc comparisons indicate that the feelings/beliefs scale mean of 4.10 for the strongly agree/agree group was significantly higher than the means of

3.48 for the uncertain group and 3.12 for the strongly disagree/disagree group. These results indicate that subjects who agreed with the court mandate had a more favorable view of teacher support than subjects who disagreed with the mandate or were uncertain about it.

TABLE 11:
POST HOC MULTIPLE COMPARISONS SUMMARY

Scale	Strongly Agree/Agree Significantly Different from Uncertain	Strongly Agree/Agree Significantly Different from Disagree	Uncertain Significantly Different from Disagree
Section A			
Responsibilities	*	*	
Feedback	*	*	*
Resources	*	*	*
Feelings/Beliefs	*	*	*
Section B			
Principal Involvement		*	*
Parent Involvement	*	*	
School Community/ Cooperation	*	*	*
Concern for Students		*	
Physical/ Emotional Environment	*	*	
TCM		*	*
RFL		*	*
Teacher Support	*	*	

Table 11 above, presents a summary of all significant results.

Hypothesis 3: No significant differences about perceptions of school climate will be found when teachers are compared by gender, experience, and grade level taught.

T-tests were used to compare the subjects grouped by gender on the means scores for each Teacher Focused Activity Questionnaire scale. The results of these analyses, presented in Table 12 below, indicate that no significant differences were found between the male and female scale score means. These findings indicate that the male and female subjects did not significantly differ in their views of responsibilities, feedback, resources, and feelings/ beliefs, as well as in their perceptions of school climate (Section B of the TFAQ).

TABLE 12:
T TESTS - TEACHER FOCUSED ACTIVITIES QUESTIONNAIRE BY GENDER

Section A	T	Df	Significance
Responsibilities	1.62	60	.10
Feedback	1.02	60	.30
Resources	1.42	60	.16
Feelings/Beliefs	.86	60	.39
Section B			
Principal Involvement	1.22	60	.22
Parent Involvement	.51	60	.60
School Comm/Coor	1.03	13.20	.31
Concern for Students	.45	12.84	.64
Phys/Emotional Environment	.01	12.18	.99
TCM	.51	60	.60
RFL	1.26	60	.20
Teacher Support	.84	13.10	.41

The means and standard deviations for each scale by gender are presented in Table 13 below.

TABLE 13:
MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS BY GENDER

	Female		Male	
Scale	**Mean**	**SD**	**Mean**	**SD**
Section A				
Responsibilities	3.85	.57	4.16	.68
Feedback	3.71	.75	3.97	.84
Resources	3.58	.70	3.89	.64
Feelings/Beliefs	4.05	.72	4.25	.72
Section B				
Principal Involvement	3.76	.55	3.98	.60
Parent Involvement	3.38	.66	3.50	.94
SCC	3.85	.52	4.11	.83
Concern	4.11	.51	4.23	.88
PEE	3.24	.53	3.25	1.14
TCM	3.81	.49	3.90	.73
RFL	3.16	1.03	3.58	1.06
Teacher Support	3.80	.72	4.10	1.16

Table 14 and Table 15 below, present the analysis of variance results for the subjects grouped by experience. The means and standard deviations by experience are presented in Table 17 below. The groups include teachers with one to 10 years of experience, 11 to 20 years of experience, and 21 to 38 years of experience. For Section A of the TFAQ, the results indicate that significant mean differences were found for responsibility and resources. For Section B of the TFAQ, significant differences were found for school communication and cooperation. The significant results are as follows:

Responsibility. The ANOVA results indicate that significant mean differences were found [$F(2,57)=3.25$, $p=.04$] between the groups based on their amount of experience as a teacher (one to 10 years, 11 to 20 years, and 21 to 38 years). Tamhane T2 post hoc comparisons were conducted to identify specific group differences. The post hoc comparisons indicate that the responsibility scale mean of 4.16 for the 11-to-20-year group was significantly higher than the mean of 3.63 for the one-to-10-year group. These results indicate that subjects with more experience had a more favorable perception of responsibility, school communication and cooperation than did subjects with less experience.

Resources. The ANOVA results indicate that significant mean differences were found [$F(2,57)=3.03$, $p=.05$] between

the groups based on their amount of experience as a teacher (one to 10 years, 11 to 20 years, and 21 to 38 years). Tamhane T2 post hoc comparisons were conducted to identify specific group differences. The post hoc comparisons indicate that the resources scale means of 4.03 for the 11-to-20-year group was significantly higher than the mean of 3.56 for the one-to-10-year group. These results indicate that subjects with more experience had a more favorable perception of resources than did subjects with less experience.

School Communication and Cooperation. The ANOVA results indicate that significant mean differences were found [$F(2,57)=3.55$, $p=.03$] between the groups based on their amount of experience as a teacher (one to 10 years, 11 to 20 years, and 21 to 38 years). Scheffe post hoc comparisons were conducted to identify specific group differences. The post hoc comparisons indicate that the school communication and cooperation scale means of 4.22 for the 11-to-20-year group was significantly higher than the mean of 3.65 for the one-to-10-year group. These results indicate that subjects with more experience had a more favorable perception of school communication and cooperation than did subjects with less experience.

While few significant mean differences were found by experience, in each case the 11-to-20-year group had more favorable perceptions than did the one-to-10-year group. No significant differences were found between these two groups

and the 21-to-38-year group. A summary of significant findings is presented in Table 17.

TABLE 14:
TEACHER FOCUSED ACTIVITIES QUESTIONNAIRE SECTION A BY EXPERIENCE

Scale	Source of Variation	Sum Of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Significance
Responsibility	Between Groups	3.33	2	1.66	3.25	.04
	Within Groups	29.19	57	.51		
	Total	32.52	59			
Feedback	Between Groups	3.57	2	1.78	2.92	.06
	Within Groups	34.73	57	.60		
	Total	38.30	59			
Resources	Between Groups	2.54	2	1.27	3.03	.05
	Within Groups	23.93	57	.42		
	Total	26.48	59			
Feelings and Beliefs	Between Groups	2.79	2	1.39	1.90	.15
	Within Groups	41.94	57	.73		
	Total	44.74	59			

TABLE 15:
TEACHER FOCUSED ACTIVITIES QUESTIONNAIRE SECTION B BY EXPERIENCE

Scale	Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Significance
Principal Involvement	Between Groups	.78	2	.39	1.18	.31
	Within Groups	18.89	57	.33		
	Total	19.68	59			
Parent Involvement	Between Groups	11.81	2	5.90	.50	.60
	Within Groups	670.76	57	11.76		
	Total	682.58	59			
School Community/ Cooperation	Between Groups	3.82	2	1.91	3.55	.03
	Within Groups	30.66	57	.53		
	Total	34.49	59			
Concern for Students	Between Groups	.67	2	.33	.75	.47
	Within Groups	25.59	57	.44		
	Total	26.27	59			
Physical/ Emotional Environment	Between Groups	.48	2	.24	.50	.60
	Within Groups	27.50	57	.48		
	Total	27.98	59			
Teacher Commitment/ Motivation	Between Groups	2.56	2	1.28	2.96	.06
	Within Groups	24.73	57	.43		
	Total	27.29	59			
Resources For Learning	Between Groups	5.58	2	2.79	2.82	.07
	Within Groups	56.40	57	.98		
	Total	61.98	59			
Teacher Support	Between Groups	.19	2	.009	.14	.86
	Within Groups	38.91	57	.68		
	Total	39.10	59			

TABLE 16:
MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS BY EXPERIENCE

	1 to 10		11 to 20		21 to 38	
Scale	**Mean**	**SD**	**Mean**	**SD**	**Mean**	**SD**
Section A						
Responsibility	3.63	.90	4.16	.27	4.00	.52
Feedback	3.60	.84	4.14	.37	3.57	.97
Resources	3.56	.70	4.03	.31	3.57	.78
Feelings	3.98	.85	4.31	.60	3.69	1.10
Section B						
Principal Involvement	3.76	.69	4.03	.33	3.86	.48
Parent Involvement	3.40	.73	3.60	.59	3.53	.67
SCC	3.65	.89	4.22	.51	4.03	.47
Concern for Student	4.00	.65	4.11	.83	4.27	.42
PEE	3.22	.82	3.43	.44	3.29	.59
TCM	3.64	.73	4.13	.54	3.80	.57
RFL	3.33	1.01	3.68	.70	2.80	1.21
TS	3.89	.98	3.96	.70	4.03	.46

TABLE 17:
POST HOC MULTIPLE COMPARISONS SUMMARY BY EXPERIENCE

Scale	1 to 10 significantly different from 11 to 20	1 to 10 significantly different from 21 to 38	11 to 20 significantly different 21 to 38
Section A			
Responsibilities	*		
Feedback			
Resources	*		
Feelings/Beliefs			
Section B			
Principal Involvement			
Parent Involvement			
School Comm/Coor	*		
Concern for Students			
Physical/Emotional Environment			
TCM			
RFL			
Teacher Support			

Table 18 and Table 19 below present the analysis of variance results for the subjects grouped by grade level taught. The means and the standard deviations by grade level taught are presented in Table 21 below. The three groups included teachers who teach Kindergarten to Second Grade, Third and Fourth Grade, and teachers who teach multiple grades. For Section A of the TFAQ the results indicate that significant mean differences were found for resources. For Section B of the TFAQ significant differences were found for principal involvement. Significant results are as follows:

Resources. The ANOVA results indicate that significant mean differences were found [$F(2,59)=3.97$, $p=.02$] between the groups based on the grade levels taught (K to 2, 3 and 4, and multiple grades). Scheffe post hoc comparisons were conducted to identify specific group differences. The post hoc comparisons indicate that the resources scale mean of 3.78 for the multiple-grades group was significantly higher than the mean of 3.19 for the K-to-2 group. These results indicate that subjects who taught multiple grades had a more favorable perception of resources than subjects who taught Kindergarten to Second grade.

Principal Involvement. The ANOVA results indicate that significant mean differences were found [$F(2,59)=3.38$, $p=.04$] between the groups based on the grade levels taught (K to 2, 3 and 4, and multiple grades). Scheffe post hoc comparisons were conducted to identify specific group

differences. The post hoc comparisons indicate that the principal involvement scale mean of 3.87 for the multiple-grades group was significantly higher than the mean of 3.38 for the K-to-2 group. These results indicate that subjects who taught multiple grades had a more favorable perception of principal involvement than subjects who taught Kindergarten to Second grade.

TABLE 18:
TEACHER FOCUSED ACTIVITIES QUESTIONNAIRE BY GRADE LEVEL--SECTION A

Scale	Source of Variation	Sum Of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Significance
Respon	Between Groups	1.84	2	.92	1.47	.23
	Within Groups	36.84	59	.62		
	Total	38.68	61			
Feedback	Between Groups	2.43	2	1.22	2.05	.13
	Within Groups	35.09	59	.59		
	Total	37.53	61			
Resources	Between Groups	3.67	2	1.83	3.97	.02
	Within Groups	27.28	59	.46		
	Total	30.59	61			
Feelings and Beliefs	Between Groups	1.31	2	.65	.90	.40
	Within Groups	42.83	59	.72		
	Total	44.14	61			

TABLE 19: TEACHER FOCUSED ACTIVITIES QUESTIONNAIRE BY GRADE LEVEL-SECTION B

Scale	Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Significance
Principal Involvement	Between Groups	2.55	2	1.27	3.38	.04
	Within Groups	22.27	59	.37		
	Total	24.83	61			
Parent Involvement	Between Groups	53.91	2	26.59	1.99	.14
	Within Groups	798.35	59	13.53		
	Total	852.27	61			
School Comm and Coord	Between Groups	2.33	2	1.16	2.03	.14
	Within Groups	33.86	59	.57		
	Total	36.19	61			
Concern for Students	Between Groups	1.25	2	.62	1.49	.23
	Within Groups	24.86	59	.42		
	Total	26.12	61			
Physical/ Emotional Environ	Between Groups	1.23	2	.61	1.36	.26
	Within Groups	26.59	59	.45		
	Total	27.82	61			
TCM	Between Groups	.20	2	.10	.22	.79
	Within Groups	27.20	59	.46		
	Total	27.41	61			
Resources For Learning	Between Groups	2.48	2	1.24	1.19	.31
	Within Groups	61.56	59	1.04		
	Total	64.04	61			
Teacher Support	Between Groups	1.69	2	.84	1.00	.37
	Within Groups	49.42	59	.83		
	Total	51.11	61			

TABLE 20:
MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS BY GRADE LEVEL TAUGHT

	K to 2		3 and 4		Other	
Scale	**Mean**	**SD**	**Mean**	**SD**	**Mean**	**SD**
Section A						
Responsibilities	3.48	.73	3.95	.43	3.84	.91
Feedback	3.37	.74	3.69	.98	3.86	.68
Resources	3.19	.56	3.57	.78	3.78	.68
Feelings	3.96	.35	4.21	1.23	3.84	.81
Section B						
Principal Involvement	3.38	.64	3.81	.53	3.87	.63
Parent Involvement	3.04	.76	3.37	.57	3.49	.77
School Communic/Cooperation	3.46	.46	3.97	.50	3.88	.92
Concern for Student	4.13	.16	4.31	.56	3.96	.79
Physical/Emotional Environment	2.97	.36	3.27	.64	3.31	.77
Teacher Commitment/ Motivation	3.66	.44	3.83	.67	3.74	.76
Resources for Learning	3.00	.96	2.92	1.05	3.36	1.03
Teacher Support	3.50	.93	3.92	.46	3.85	1.03

Table 21 below, presents a multiple comparison summary by grade

level taught. These results indicate that subjects of K thru 2

had more favorable perceptions in the areas of Resources in

Section A and Parent Involvement in Section B.

TABLE 21:
POST HOC MULTIPLE COMPARISONS SUMMARY BY GRADE LEVEL TAUGHT

Scale	K to 2 significantly different from 3/4	K to 2 significantly different from Other	¾ significantly different Other
Section A			
Responsibilities			
Feedback			
Resources			
Feelings			
Section B			
Principal Involvement			
Parent Involvement			
School Communication/ Cooperation			
Concern for Student			
Physical/ Emotional Environment			
Teacher Commitment/ Motivation			
Resources for Learning			
Teacher Support			

CHAPTER V:
SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter summarizes this study's findings and then presents conclusions and recommendations. The chapter is divided into four sections: summary of the study, findings, conclusions, and recommendations.

Summary

The purpose of this study was to examine the implementation process of a specific program dealing with school reform. The main focus was placed on a recently developed educational innovation which, in turn, raised two important issues: how reform is being implemented and what kinds of relationships and communication procedures have arisen in the implementation process.

This study examined the perceptions held by teachers in an urban school in New Jersey regarding the implementation of a whole-school reform. In particular, the study explored the question of whether there are significant differences in attitudes toward innovation between teachers who have supported the New Jersey Supreme Court order mandating equalized school funding and those who did not.

Recent years have witnessed a growth in innovational programs that require teacher acceptance prior to their implementation. Considerable research supports the theory that teacher acceptance of program implementation impacts upon the perceptions, responsibilities, resources, and beliefs of such teachers who are involved in an innovation process (Slavin, 1994).

Past research found that innovations to be implemented are often introduced or championed by one or a small number of staff members; it is equally clear that a new program may quickly disappear when the pioneering staff member(s) departs. With this in mind, the present study measured teacher perceptions toward the implementation of the Success for All (SFA) program in the New Jersey school. The study took into account such variables as years of experience as a teacher, prior and current involvement in an innovative program, gender, grade level taught, and school climate. Whether there were any correlations between teacher perceptions of school climate, available resources, feedback, etc. and their support (or lack of support) for mandated educational innovations may in the future help educators and others analyze barriers to the adoption of innovation and facilitate the removal of such barriers.

Some limitations may have affected the findings of this study, including the fact that data are only reported and analyzed from those staff members who completed and returned the Teacher Focused Activities Questionnaire (TFAQ) that had

been distributed to them. Secondly, the relatively small sample of this study may make its findings difficult to generalize to broader numbers of teachers.

Findings

The present study advanced and investigated three hypotheses:

Hypothesis 1: No significant differences in perceptions of responsibilities, feedback, resources, and feelings/beliefs will be found between those teachers who did and did not support the court mandate to implement the Success for All program.

Hypothesis 2: No significant differences in perceptions of school climate will be found between those teachers who did and did not support the court mandate to implement the Success for All program.

Hypothesis 3: No significant differences about perceptions of school climate will be found when teachers are compared by gender, experience, and grade level taught.

Key findings were as follows:

•Data collected from Section A of the TFAQ found that for each of the four scales—responsibilities, feedback, resources, and feelings/beliefs—those teachers who indicated agreement or strong agreement with the court mandate for innovation expressed significantly more positive perceptions than did the teachers who were either uncertain or who disagreed or strongly disagreed with the court

mandate. Moreover, teachers who were uncertain about the court mandate in turn expressed a more positive perception than did those teachers who disagreed or strongly disagreed on the feedback, resources, and feelings/beliefs scales.

•Data collected from Section B of the TFAQ found that those teachers who agreed or strongly agreed with the court mandate expressed significantly higher levels of positive perceptions than did those teachers who disagreed or strongly disagreed on the following scales: principal involvement, parent involvement, school community/coordination, concern for students, physical and emotional environment, teacher commitment/motivation, resources for learning, and teacher support.

Furthermore, teachers who agreed or strongly agreed expressed significantly higher levels of positive perceptions than did those teachers who were uncertain with the court mandate on the following scales: parent involvement, school community/coordination, physical and emotional environment, teacher commitment/motivation, and teacher support.

•Teachers who were uncertain about the court mandate expressed significantly higher levels of positive perceptions than did those teachers who disagreed or strongly disagreed on the following scales: principal involvement, school communication coordination, teacher commitment/motivation, and resources for learning.

•No significant differences in teacher perceptions were

found when the teachers were compared by years of teaching experience. Those teachers who had between 11 and 20 years of teaching experience had a significantly higher level of positive perceptions than did those teachers who had one to 10 years of experience with respect to the following scales: responsibilities, resources, and school communication/ coordination.

•When teachers were compared by grade level taught, those who had taught multiple grade levels expressed significantly higher levels of positive perceptions than did those teachers who taught only one grade in the Kindergarten through Second Grade range.

Conclusion

The present study demonstrated consistency with Carney (1994), who found that a school's principal contributed to the successful implementation, and that the principal employed effective change characteristics during the implementation process. Another consistency between the present study and Carney's study was the fact that both schools were change-oriented even before the primary program was introduced, and continued to be so oriented throughout the implementation process.

Similarly, Lavery (1993) identified two important personal factors: Mentioned first was a transformed perspective, that is, changed ideas about the nature of learning and teaching motivated teachers to transform their

classroom practice. The second factor was that the role of mentors and collaborating colleagues was often significant in influencing teachers' implementation efforts. Mentors included traditional mentors, such as senior or more knowledgeable individuals to whom the teacher turned for guidance.

Another aspect of Lavery's research revealed those teacher's perceptions that their implementation efforts would be welcomed and encouraged was an important and necessary factor in determining whether they actually made an implementation effort. Organizational policies and procedures helped, hindered, or prevented teachers' implementation efforts. Lavery further suggested that teachers be encouraged to continue and increase their implementation efforts. This researcher concurs with Lavery's conclusion that the responses of students are of importance to teachers; when student responses are negative regarding teachers' methods, the teachers would be more likely to strive to overcome their weaknesses.

The findings of the present study also supported Bradley's research. Bradley employed a research design comprised of descriptive statistics, qualitative interviews, and an in-service design factor questionnaire. The findings also concurred with teacher change literature, which has found that teachers require from 12 to 18 months of using an innovation before they become routine users of that innovation. Thus, it appears to be quite definite that a

crucial factor in bringing about teacher approval for the Success for All program implementation is how the teachers feel about court mandated innovations.

The findings of the current study also appear to be consistent with Henry (1995). Henry examined teachers' beliefs pertaining to the mathematics curriculum, their teaching practices, and their attitudes toward learning. Henry investigated the ways in which these beliefs and attitudes interacted with other factors in the implementation of a set of innovative curriculum materials, and found that these beliefs and attitudes were favorable. The present study's findings revealed that subjects who agreed with the court mandate likewise had a more favorable view of their feelings and beliefs.

The present study is consistent with Afflerbach's (1996) findings. Afflerbach's interviews with teachers, principals, and curriculum coordinators revealed that adherence to mandated statewide programs was not without considerable challenges. The present research found that school personnel reported that the implementation of the Success for All program and intended school change was made more difficult by an absence of correspondence between existing instruction and performance assessment and, on the other hand, the instruction and performance assessment which was mandated.

Additional consistency was demonstrated in the fact

that the situation was further complicated by a lack of alignment between teacher practices and beliefs and, on the other hand, those explicated in the statewide program. The data in the present study suggest that overcoming barriers to implementation of the statewide program requires a systematic approach that bridges communication barriers between those people involved in the curriculum, instruction, and the performance assessment materials and procedures.

In the present study, when the teachers were compared along the dimension of experience, the results were consistent with Wisard (1998). Wisard investigated how the beliefs, perceptions, decision-making, and behavior scales (defined as the teachers' sense of efficacy) of classroom instructors influenced the meaning of their experiences during the implementation of a conflict resolution program. Wisard employed qualitative research using the case study method to examine data. When extrapolated to a larger population, analysis indicated that most teachers have had particular background experiences at their schools which have shaped their perceptions about handling interpersonal conflict. It was noted by Wisard that certain conditions in the school setting would transfer to the classroom and serve to encourage or hinder the use of the given innovation.

The present study was also consistent with Grady's (1995) research. Grady found that individual change at a very complex level is possible if a school support system is

in place which promotes growth and allows for flexibility. This finding supports the feedback scale of the present study—there is a need for administrative support in the innovation process, along with the notion that the innovation must be thoroughly understood and that teachers must receive feedback once they are in the process of implementing the innovation.

The present study did not, however, concur with the findings of Semmel and Gerber (1990). Semmel and Gerber criticized programs that implement the Regular Education Initiative for their relatively simplistic approaches to the instructional problems that sometimes created diversity.

Staff teaching in a multi-grade level situation/program would allow the teacher to be exposed to students of various achievement and performance levels. It would make available the opportunity to teach students and allow them to progress based upon their ability to process information. This process would encourage staff members to be cognizant of skills that are needed at various grade levels (Kindergarten, First, and Second). The instructional mode would require teachers to design their delivery instruction around the ability of the students rather than the set curriculum. This kind of educational setting would be advantageous to those students with accelerated skills and ability.

Recommendations

As noted in Chapter III, teacher perceptions toward change in one urban school of a court-mandated program (Success for All) revealed interesting findings that will support the need for further examination of the implementation process. The present study called on teachers to respond to a comprehensive series of questions pertaining to the existence of such factors as years of experience teaching, grade level taught, prior and current involvement in an innovative program, gender, and school climate.

Several factors impacted the implementation of the Success for All program. In light of this study's findings and conclusions, several recommendations are advanced by the researcher.

•The present study revealed that teachers' perceptions of the court mandate (positive or negative perceptions) are related to how they feel about the school's climate. Thus, further research should investigate those factors that may relate to teacher acceptance or rejection of court mandates. What can educators do to make the mandate more acceptable so that teachers see it as part of a solution, rather than as a problem? What can courts do to fashion a mandate in such a way that it is acceptable to educators?

•This study can be replicated at other grade levels; the results can then be compared to the findings of the present study. For example, do sixth-grade, seventh-grade, and eighth-grade teachers have different perspectives

regarding court-mandated change than do teachers in the earlier grades? However, keeping in mind the limitation mentioned in Chapter One of this study, with regard to this replication scenario and the ones that appear below, it is suggested that the studies be carried out in schools in which the principal is not the researcher.

•Further research can investigate whether teachers would have different perceptions if they taught students from different socio-economic levels. Would teacher perceptions of responsibilities, feedback, resources, and feelings/beliefs fluctuate from one grade level to the next?

•Further research can investigate the present study's findings that teachers in grades Kindergarten-through-Second Grade were significantly different in the resources and parental involvement scales from teachers in Grades 3 and 4.

•Future research can examine the present study's finding that staff members having one-to-10 years of experience had more favorable perceptions on the scales of responsibilities, resources, and school/community cooperation than they had on the other scales.

•Future research can replicate the present study's methodology at other schools in the same school district or other urban school districts and draw relevant comparisons. And the present study's methodology can be replicated in suburban schools to ascertain whether there are significant differences between urban and suburban teachers regarding implementation of court mandated changes.

•Future study can investigate whether there are any correlations between teacher perceptions of school climate, available resources, feedback, etc., and their support (or lack of it) for mandated educational innovations; such findings may in the future help educators and others analyze barriers to the adoption of innovation and therefore facilitate the removal of such barriers.

•Finally, the present study clearly demonstrates that teacher perceptions regarding a court mandate in turn have a direct impact on their perceptions as regards their position and school climate. Further research should investigate factors, personal characteristics, or demographic variables which have an impact on teacher acceptance.

References

Afflerbach, P.P. (1996). Barriers to the implementation of a statewide performance program: School personnel perspectives. Reading Research Report No. 51. Athens, GA: National Reading Research Center.

Alexander, P.A. (1996). Of squalls and fathoms: Navigating the seas of educational innovation. Educational Researcher, 25(3), 31-36.

Allinder, R.M. & Oats, R.G. (1997). Effects of acceptability on teachers' implementation of curriculum-based measurement and student achievement in mathematics computation. Remedial and Special Education, 18(2), 113-120.

Berman, P. & McLaughlin, M.W. (1978). Federal programs supporting educational change, implementing and sustaining innovations, Vol. VIII. California: Rand R-1589/8-HEW.

Bondy, E., Kilgore, K., Ross, D., & Webb, R. (1994). Building blocks and stumbling blocks. New York: Teachers College Press.

Bradley, R.F. (1992). Teachers' receptivity to educational change: Teacher receptivity, change process. Dissertation Abstracts International, 53(07A). (University Microfilms No. AAIMM88443).

Carnegie Foundation on Education and the Economy. (1986). A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century, a report of the task force on teaching as a

profession. New York: Carnegie Corporation.

Carney, J.P. (1994). The use of effective change characteristics inimplementing Kentucky's primary program. Dissertation Abstracts International, (University Microfilms No. Ed382353).

Carr, P.R. (1997). Stuck in the middle? A case study of how principals manage equity-related change in education. Education Canada, 37(1), 42-49.

Cartas, R.A. (1998). The relationship between technology use by classroom teachers and factors which promote innovation adoption. Dissertation Abstracts International, 59(08A). (University Microfilms No.AAI9902779).

Collins, R.A. & Hanson, M.K. (1991). Summative Evaluation Report: School-Based management/shared decision-making Project, 1987-1990. Miami: Dade County Public Schools. ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 331 922.

Crandall, D.P., Loucks, S.F., Bauchner, J.E., Schmidt, W.B., Eiseman, J.W., Cox,P.L., Miles, M.B., Huberman, A.M., Taylor, B.L., Goldberg, J.A., Shive, G., Thompson, C.L., & Taylor, J.A. (1982). People, Policies, and practices: Examining the chain of chain improvement. [Available from THE NETWORK, Inc., Andover, MA 0810]

Cuban, L. (1988). Constancy and change in schools. In P.W. Jackson (Ed.), Contributing to educational

change (pp. 85-105). Berkeley, CA: Mccutchan.

David, J.L. (1990). Restructuring in progress: Lessons from pioneering districts. In R. Elmore (Ed.), Restructuring schools: The next generation of educational reform (pp. 209-249). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Drake, S. (1992). Effecting educational change: The journey of Simcoe Street School, Urban Review, 24(4), 287-302.

Elmore, R. (1990). Restructuring schools: The next generation of education reform. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Elmore, R. & McLaughlin, M.W. (1988). Steady work: Policy, practice, and the reform of American education. Santa Monica: Rand Corporation.

Fullan, M. (1988). The evolution of research on planned educational change in North America. Paper presented at seminar of the International School Improvement Project, Organization for Educational and Community Development, New York, New York.

Fullan, M.G. & Steigelbauer, S. (1991). The new meaning of educational change. New York: Teachers College Press.

Gajria, M. & Salend, S.J. (1996). Treatment acceptability: A critical dimension for overcoming teacher resistance to implementing adaptations for mainstreamed students. Reading and Writing Quarterly,

12(1), 91-108.

George, C.A. (1996). Stories of mixed success: Program improvement implementation in Chapter 1 schools. Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk, 1(1),77-93.

Gersten, R. (1986). A multifaceted study of change in seven inner-city schools. Elementary School Journal, 86(3), 257-276.

Goldsmith, D.A. (1995). The influence of the implementation of a science reform initiative: Teachers' perceptions and development of levels of concern. Dissertation Abstracts International, 58(06A). (University Microfilms No. University of Alabama (0004). Volume 58-06A p. 2078).

Goodlad, J. (1984). A place called school: Prospects for the future. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Grady, Michael P, (1995). Teachers' Perceptions of a Pedagogic Innovation: Barriers and Mechanism for Successful Implementation. Saint-Louis-University (0193) Volume 56-09A.3443.

Hall, G.E. & Hord, S.M (1987). Change in schools: Facilitating the process. New York: State University ofNew York Press.

Hall, G.E. & Loucks, S.F. (1978). Teacher concerns as a basis for facilitating and personalizing staff development. Teachers College Record, 80, 36-53.

Hargreaves, A. (1994). Changing teachers, changing times.London: Cassell.

Havelock, R.G. & Zlotolow, S. (1995). The Change agent's guide. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Educational Technology Publications.

Haycock, K.R. (1991). The nature and delivery of school district services and school-based management. Dissertation Abstracts International, 52 No. 2769).

Henry, J.J. (1995). Interactions between teacher beliefs and the implementation of a mathematics curriculum innovation. Dissertation Abstracts International, 56(10A). (University Microfilms No. AAI9603599).

Hillnan, M. (1995 p.1) Restructuring at the School Lebel and Student Performance Outcome/Reasons why Restructuring Fail. (Available by: Agewa Zeming B. Ed. M. Ed.) InternetSite: http://www.gse.ecel.uwa.edu.au/gse/oxed/vol3/Agewa.html

Hope, W.C. (1995). Microcomputer technology: Its impact on teachers in an elementary school. Dissertation Abstracts International, 56(03A). (University Microfilms No. AAI9526491).

Hord, S.M., Rutherford, W.L., Huling-Austin, L., & Hall, G.E. (1987). Taking charge of change. Alexandria, VA: Associationfor Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Howe, A.C. & Bell, J. (1998). Factors associated with successful implementation of interdisciplinary curriculum units. Research in Middle Level Education Quarterly, 21(2), 39-52.

Inbar, D.E. (1993). Success-failure configurations in educational planning. Educational Planning, 9(2), 3-10.

Jenni, R.W. & Mauriel, J.J. (1990). An examination of the factors affecting stakeholders' assessment of school decentralization. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston.

Kendrick, A.G. (1993). Introduction of an innovation: Perception of its role in altering the context of the school. Dissertation AbstractS International, 53(08A). (University Microfilms No. Volume 53-08A p. 2658).

Kershaw, A. (1996). People, planning, and process: The acceptance of technological innovation in post-secondary organizations. Educational Technology, 36 (Sept./Oct.), 44-48.

Knutel, P.G. (1998). Adoption of an innovation: The process through which faculty decide whether to use inStructional technology. Dissertation Abstracts International, 59(10A). (University Microfilms No. AAI9909915).

Lavery, R.H. (1993). Teachers' experience in implementing a changed perspective. Dissertation Abstracts International, 54(09A). (University Microfilms No. Innovation. University of Toronta , Canada (0779 volume 54-09A p. 3404).

Luze, G.J. (1997). The relationship of intervention acceptability and integrity in general classroom interventions: Project LIFT. Ames, Iowa: Iowa State University Press.

Macchiavelli, N. (1996). The Prince. Baltimore: Penguin Books.

Malen, B. & Ogawa, R.T. (1988). Professional-patron influence on site-based governance councils: A confounding case study. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 19(3), 251-270.

Manginelli, R.C. (1998). Teacher, administrator, and support staff behaviors toward and perception of the implementation of a change. Dissertation Abstracts International, 59(11A). (University Microfilms No. AAI9913307).

Miller, L. & Lieberman, A. (1988). School improvement in the United States: Nuance and numbers. Qualitative Studies in Education, 1(1), 3-19.

Murphy, J. & Beck, L. (1995). School-based management as school reform: Taking stock. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press. A nation prepared: Teachers for the 21st century. (1986). New York: Carnegie Forum on

Education and the Economy.

Nickey, J.M. (1997). The relationship between selected teacher, characteristics and perceptions toward experienced change. Dissertation Abstracts International, 59(01A). (University Microfilms No. AAI9822845).

Pasow, A.H. (1986). Beyond the commission reports: Toward meaningful school improvement. In A. Lieberman (Ed.),Rethinking school improvement. New York: Teachers College Press.

Pogrow, S. (2000). Success for All does not produce success for students. Phi Delta Kappan,82(1), 67-80.

Purkey, S.C. (1990). School-based management: More and less meets the eye. In W.H. Clune & J.F. Witte (Eds.), Choice and control in American education, Vol. II (pp. 371-390). Philadelphia: Falmer Press.

Reigeluth, C.M. (1987). The search for meaningful reform: A third-wave educational system. Journal of Instructional Development, 10(4), 3-14.

Rhodes, L. (1988). Linking up with empowerment. The School Administrator, 45(9), 39-40.

Ridder, D.C. (1997). School and teacher characteristics which influence the teaching of applied academics. Dissertation Abstracts International, 59, (07A). (University Microfilms No.AAI9841358).

Rogers, E. (1961). Characteristics of agricultural innovators and other adopter categories. Wooster, Ohio: Agricultural Experiment Station Research Bulletin 882.

Rogers, E.M. & Shoemaker, F.F. (1971). Communication of innovations: A cross-cultural approach. New York: Free Press.

Rollow, S.G. & Bryk, A.S. (1993). The Chicago experiment: The potential and the reality of reform. Equity and Choice, 9(3), 22-32.

Ross, S.M. (1997). The success of schools in implementing eight restructuring designs: A synthesis of first-year evaluation outcomes. School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 8(1), 95-124.

Russell, J.F., Jarmin, H.R., & Reiser, M.L. (1997). Interdisciplinary teaming in the middle school: The relationship of implementation to teachers' attitudes over time. ERS Spectrum, 15(4), 32-33.

Sarason, S. (1982). The culture of school and the problem of change. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Semmel, M.I. & Gerber, M.M. (1990). If at first you don't succeed, bye, bye again: A response to general educators' views on the REI. Remedial and Special Education, 11(4), 53-59.

Sergiovanni, T.J. (1996). Leadership for the schoolhouse. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. SERVE SouthEastern Regional Vision for Education. Office of Educational Research and Improvement(ED), Washington,

DC 1995 EDRS MF01/PC03, Research (143)

Shapley, K.S. & Pinto, M.F. (1997). Implementing portfolio assessment in the primary grades: Teachers' perspectives.ERS Spectrum, 15(2), 41-47. Sizer, T.R. (1972). Places for learning, places for joy.Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Sizer, T.R. (1972). Places for learning, places for joy. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Slavin, R. (1994). Scaling up: Lessons learned in the dissemination of Success for All. Baltimore: Center for Research on the Education of Students Placed at Risk.

Slavin, R. & Madden. N. (2000). Research on achievement outcomes of Success for All. Phi Delta Kappan, 82(1), 38-40, 59-66.

Slavin, Robert E., (1996) Office of Educational Research and Improvements of the U.S. Department of Education. Success For All: A Summary of Research. A Nation Study. The Carnegie Corporation, the Pew Charitable Trusts, and the Abell foundation. Adaptation of paper presented at the Annual Conference of the American Educational research Association (San Francisco, CA., April 1995).

Smith, L.J. (1997). Activities in schools and programs experiencing the most, and least, early implementation success. School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 8(1), 125-150.

Speck, M. (1996). The change process in a school learning community. School Community Journal, 6(1), 69-79.

Strusinski, M. (1991). The continuing development of shared decision-making in school-based management. Miami: Dade County Public Schools. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED. 331 185).

Tarde, G. (1903, 1969). The laws of imitation. New York: Henry Holt.

Timar, T. (1989). The politics of school restructuring. Phi Delta Kappan, 71, 265-275.

Tinzmann, M.B., Jones, B.F., & Fine, C. (1990). What are some approaches to reform? New and old definitions of change.
Internet Site:
http://www.ncrel.org/sdrs/areaS/rpl_esys/
reform.htm.

Trachtman, L.E., Spirek, M.M., Sparks, G.G., & Stohl, C. (1991).Factors affecting the adoption of a new technology. Bulletin of Science, Technology, and Society, 11(6), 338-345.

Useem, E. (1997). Reforming alone: Barriers to organizational learning in urban school change initiatives. Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk, 2(1), 55-78.

Weaver, R.L. (1997). Innovation propensity of teachers and their acceptance and implementation of the

primary school programs in Kentucky. Dissertation Abstracts International, 58(01A). (University Microfilms No. AAI9735704).

Wisard, R.L. (1998). Educational innovation and Teacher Efficacy: The case of three urban school classroom teachers implementing conflict resolution. Dissertation Abstracts International, 59(03A). (University Microfilms No. AAI9826284).

Witte, R.S. (1985). Statistics. New York: CBS College Publishing.

Wolfson, G.K. (1996). Prior learning assessment: A Case study of acceptance of innovation and change. Fort Lauderdale, FL:Nova Southeastern University.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: LETTER TO DR. MORAN

Joseph Sinatra Fulmore, Sr.
122 East 38th Street
Paterson, New Jersey 07514

Dr. Judith Moran
110 Chatham Avenue
Paterson, New Jersey 07502

July 16, 1999

Dear Dr. Moran;

It was indeed a pleasure for me, having the opportunity to talk with you on July 16, 1999. It brought a reflection of many memories during your tenure as President the Paterson Board of Education, Paterson, New Jersey. It was during this period, in my opinion, that your leadership skills became apparent as a trailblazer for children and education. As you continue to achieve your goals and objectives in the area of education, I commend you for being the individual you are.

As discussed with you, by way of telephone, on July 17, 1999, my pursuit as a doctoral student where you completed your Doctoral Degree, Seton Hall University in South Orange, New Jersey, please allow me again to call upon you for support. Dr. Moran, I am in the process of conducting my research on the implementation process of the Success For All Program in the Paterson Public School System. In order for me to continue the process, I am requesting permission to alter and adapt your survey on the "Survey of Perceptions of Teaching Personnel with Regard to the Levels of Implementation in Site-Based Managed Schools." I found your instrument somewhat relative to my topic.

Enclosed, please find a copy of my survey for your review and response. I would appreciate very much your review as soon as possible. Again, I thank you for allowing me to utilize your questionnaire and adapting it to my research.

If you have any questions regarding this matter, please feel free to contact me at 973-881-0662 home or 973-881-6030 work. My fax number at home is 973-881-1923 and work 973-8812479.

Yours in education,

Joseph Sinatra Fulmore, Sr.

c. File
Enclosure

APPENDIX B: LETTER TO STAFF

Joseph S. Fulmore, Sr.
122 East 30th Street
Paterson, New Jersey 07514

August 11, 1999

Dear Staff,

This survey is being used as a part of my doctoral study in education. I am a doctoral student at Seton Hall University in South Orange, NJ. Please be assured that all responses will remain anonymous. Should you choose to participate, please supply the information and return the survey to the researcher in the stamped envelope by October 4, 1999. Do not include your name anywhere on the survey. Completion of this survey indicates your willingness to participate in this research project.

This project has been reviewed and approved by the Seton Hall University Institutional Review board for Human Subjects Research. The IRB Institutional Review board believes that the research procedures adequately safeguard the subject's privacy, welfare, civil liberties, and rights. The Chairperson of the IRB may be reached through the Office of Grants and Research Services. The telephone number of the Office is (973-275-2974).

I am writing you to ask for your voluntary participation in a research project that I am conducting on the implementation of the Success For All Program in your school. This survey compares how teacher acceptance impacts on the implementation of the Success For All in an Urban School District. My research focuses on the implementation process of the Success For All Program.

I have enclosed a survey that rates the teacher perceptions on the implementation process of the Success For All Program. The length of time to conduct the survey will be no more than fifteen minutes. Only the aggregated results will be reported so that confidentiality will be maintained at all times. Input through this survey is crucial to the success of my research. The withdrawal from this activity at any time will be recognized without prejudice.

If you have questions, please do not hesitate to contact me, Joseph S. Fulmore, Principal Public School Number Six, 137 Carroll Street, Paterson, New Jersey, 07501. Telephone number 973-881-6030. The Institutional Review Board (IRB) of Seton Hall University has approved this survey for the purpose of anonymous research.

Your input is greatly appreciated. It is my hope that this research will provide me with a better understanding of the implementation process and teacher acceptance of the Success For All Program. I thank you for your anticipated cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

Joseph Sinatra Fulmore, Sr.

APPENDIX C: TFAQ SURVEYS

Part A :Level of Agreement- (Five Point Likert Like Scale)

This section of the survey asks you to respond to a number of statements about your school's efforts with regard to the Success For All Program and implementation activities.
Directions: Please indicate your response to the following statements by circling the appropriate response in the right hand column.

Level of agreement- (Five Point Likert Like Scale)

Strongly Agree	Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
5	4	3	2	1

1. I believe that my role as a teacher has been redefined to support the Success For All Program. 5 4 3 2 1

2. I believe that I show active support for the implementation of the new program. 5 4 3 2 1

3. I believe the activities provided by the developer are innovative and motivating. 5 4 3 2 1

4. I believe that the feedback sessions which followed the monitoring process have been beneficial. 5 4 3 2 1

5. I have been given encouragement by the principal throughout the implementation process. 5 4 3 2 1

6. I have been given encouragement by the consultants throughout the implementation process. 5 4 3 2 1

7. I have been given encouragement by the facilitator throughout the implementation process. 5 4 3 2 1

8. The district provides me with the resources to access staff development programs. 5 4 3 2 1

9. I have had a direct role in leading the process of change by implementing the model. 5 4 3 2 1

10.My tutoring activities are evident. 5 4 3 2 1

11. The "Family Support" component is functional. 5 4 3 2 1

12. Time has been made available to me for planning. 5 4 3 2 1

13. Time is allotted to permit me to share ideas with my colleagues. 5 4 3 2 1

14. I believe teachers can/have participated in problem solving and team building activities. 5 4 3 2 1

15. I believe all teachers were made aware of the Success For All structure through an orientation. 5 4 3 2 1

16. The monitoring process is helpful to me for implementing the model. 5 4 3 2 1

17. The consultants have provided support to me throughout the implementation process. 5 4 3 2 1

18. Instructional materials are readily available to me for instruction. 5 4 3 2 1

19.The developer provided me with workshops to help insure a smooth transition into the model. 5 4 3 2 1

20. I supported the court decision to mandate the implementation of the Success For All Model as a model. 5 4 3 2 1

Part B: School Climate

I would like to get your opinion about several aspects of your school. Please respond honestly to all questions. If you are UNSURE in your feeling about a question please put "U" for the question. Please DO NOT SKIP a question. Use the following guide to indicate your answer.

5 = Strongly Agree
4 = Agree
3 = Uncertain
2 = Disagree
1 = Strongly Disagree

1. ____ There is cooperation throughout this school
2. ____ Parents are involved in this school.
3. ____ I am optimistic that this school will improve.
4. ____ School personnel spend adequate time communicating with parents.
5. ____ Teachers in this school are making a difference in the lives of students.
6. ____ This school is getting better.
7. ____ Students feel safe coming to and going from this school.
8. ____ Goals and priorities for the school are clear.
9. ____ Parents are well informed of their children's progress.
10. ____ This school is concerned about students' social and emotional development.
11. ____ Parents are able to communicate about the running of the school.
12. ____ This school is clean and orderly.
13. ____ Violence in this school is not one of my concerns.
14. ____ Teachers in this school really care about their students.
15. ____ I am highly visible throughout this school.
16. ____ Most parents would rate this school as superior.
17. ____ Most parents are involved in an over-all home and school support network.
18. ____ Teachers receive the support of parents for the work they do.
19. ____ Teacher receive the support of the school administration in enforcing school rules.
20. ____ Teachers make a conscious effort to coordinate their teaching with each other.
21. ____ Staff members support and encourage each other at this school.
22. ____ There is a great deal of cooperative effort among staff members.
23. ____ Staff members are recognized for a job well done.
24. ____ I require and regularly review lesson plans.

25.____ The principal makes frequent classroom visitation.

26.____ The principal is very active in securing resources and promoting staff development for the faculty.

27.____ The principal uses test results to recommend modifications or changes in the instructional program.

28.____ The school's communication network is open to effective two-way exchanges among administrators and teachers.

29.____ At the principal's initiative, teacher's work together to effectively coordinate the instructional program within and between grades.

30.____ I am optimistic that this school will improve.

31.____ School personnel spend adequate time communicating with parents.

32.____ Teachers and parents spend time working together.

33.____ Teachers in this school are making a difference I the lives of students.

34.____This school is getting better.

35.____This school seems like a big family, everyone is close and friendly.

36.____Goals and priorities for the school are clear.

37.____This school is concerned about students' social and emotional development.

38.____This school is clean and orderly.

39.____This school is effectively led.

Questions 40 through 62 pertain to various aspects of your school. I would like your opinion about these things. Please respond honestly to all questions. If you are unsure in your feelings about a question please write the letter "U" for that question. Please DO NOT skip any question. Use the following guide to indicate your answer for each statement.

5 = Strongly Agree

4 = Agree

3 = Uncertain

2 = Disagree

1 = Strongly Disagree

School Climate continues.

40.____ My success or failure as a teacher is due primarily to factors beyond my control.

41.____ The level of student misbehavior (e.g., noise, fighting in the halls or cafeteria) in this school interferes with my teaching.

42.____ I have the support of the school administration in enforcing school rules.

43.____ I feel safe coming to and going from this school.

44.____There is a great deal of cooperative effort among staff members.

45.___Staff members are recognized for a job well done.

46.____I have an adequate workspace where I can work.

47.____I have necessary basic materials (e.g., textbooks and supplies) for my teaching.

48.___My classroom is clean.

49.____My classroom has broken windows.

50.____My classroom has chipped and peeling paint.

51.____On a typical day, my classroom is seldom disrupted by student misbehavior.

52.____On a typical day, my classroom is often disrupted by announcements, messengers, from the office, students coming in tardy, noise in the hallway, etc.

53.____ I have had to spend my own money for school supplies and materials.

54.____ The principal requires frequently reViews of lesson plans.

55.____ The principal frequently communicates to indiVidual teachers their responsibilities in relation to student achievement.

56.___There is clear, strong, centralized instructional leadership from the principal in this school.

57.___ Supervision is directed at instruction.

58.___The principal make sure that reviews and interpretations of test results with and for the faculty.

59.____Supervision is directed at instruction.

60.___The school's administrators understand the needs of teachers.

61.___Teachers in this school are provided with adequate feedback concerning their professional performance.

62.___ Student behavior is generally positive in this school.

Part C: Open Ended Questions:

1. Please comment on the effectiveness of implementing the Success For All Program.

2. Are there any barriers to your implementation of Success For All Program?

Part D

Please complete the following questions pertaining to you as an educator.

1. Please list the number of years as a teacher _____

2. Have you ever been involved in an innovative educational program in the past? __yes ___no,

   If yes please give a brief description of the program.

3. Are you still involved in an innovative program? ___yes ____no

4. Gender _____female _____male

5.. Please indicate the grade that you are teaching at the moment:

Kindergarten____

First_____

Second_____

Third_____

Fourth____

Others_____

APPENDIX D: Dr. J. Moran's Survey

Part II — SURVEY

The second section of this survey asks you to respond to a number of statements about your district and school efforts with regard to site-based management and staff development activities. References to change and/or innovation are synonymous to the terms site/school-based management and shared decision-making.

Directions: Please indicate the degree of implementation by circling the appropriate response in the right hand column.

Level of implementation:

Fully Implemented	Largely Implemented	Partially Implemented	Negligibly Implemented	Not Implemented
5	4	3	2	1

1. The district delegates responsibility and accountability to the school site.	5 4 3 2 1
2. The role of the chief school administrator has been redefined to support site-based management.	5 4 3 2 1
3. District staff shows active support for the implementation of the new program.	5 4 3 2 1
4. Staff development activities have been continual during the implementation of site-based management.	5 4 3 2 1
5. Implementation plans incorporate monitoring and feedback procedures.	5 4 3 2 1
6. Resources such as time, money, materials and facilities, have been made available to teachers, through the allocation of the school budget for implementation activities when they are needed and until the program is institutionalized.	5 4 3 2 1
7. The district supports site-based management through the decentralization of resources and responsibility to the school site.	5 4 3 3 1
8. The concept, goals and outcomes of site-based management have been clearly defined.	5 4 3 2 1
9. The channels of communication are open to permit feedback to building principals and district personnel.	5 4 3 2 1
10. School staffs receive positive recognition during all stages of the change process.	5 4 3 2 1

11.	The school staff, building principal and chief school administrator are committed to site-based management.	5 4 3 2 1
12.	The district provides building principals with the resources to access staff development programs for teachers.	5 4 3 2 1
13.	Principals support the implementation process by creating a positive climate (collegiality, communication and trust).	5 4 3 2 1
14.	Principals play a direct and active role in leading the process of change by working with staff to develop, execute and monitor the implementation plan.	5 4 3 2 1
15.	Staff development activities are a part of the school plan which is long term and directed toward school goals.	5 4 3 2 1
16.	The district has developed parental support and understanding of site-based management and its implications.	5 4 3 2 1
17.	The role of the teacher has been redefined to support site-based management.	5 4 3 2 1
18.	The role of parents has been redefined to support site-based management.	5 4 3 2 1
19.	The need for professional and staff development programs is determined by the district staff in consultation with the school staff.	5 4 3 2 1
20.	Funds and time have been made available to the school staff for planning.	5 4 3 2 1
21.	The content of staff development has been relevant to the needs and for problems at the school site.	5 4 3 2 1
22.	Professional and staff development programs have included follow-up activities.	5 4 3 2 1
23.	Staff development has provided opportunities for teachers to share experiences and expertise.	5 4 3 2 1
24.	District personnel provide technical assistance during the implementation process.	5 4 3 2 1
25.	Evaluation in the early stages of implementation have been directed toward facilitating the implementation of the innovation.	5 4 3 2 1
26.	Implementation plans for site-based management have set clear goals and objectives.	5 4 3 2 1
27.	Teachers have had the support of the building principals for the implementation of site-based management.	5 4 3 2 1

28. The role of the building principal has been redefined to support site-based management. 5 4 3 2 1

29. Staff development has been provided for all groups when necessary to meet new roles and new responsibilities. 5 4 3 2 1

30. Principals have supported the implementation by acknowledging teachers' concerns, providing personal time and assistance and rewarding teachers' efforts. 5 4 3 2 1

31. Teachers are involved in site-based decision-making. 5 4 3 2 1

32. Staff development activities have provided for collaboration among the teaching staff. 5 4 3 2 1

33. Staff development is based upon teacher identified needs and the needs of the school and district. 5 4 3 2 1

34. The role of district personnel (for example: supervisor vs. coordinator) has been redefined to support site-based management. 5 4 3 2 1

35. The district has provided a supportive organizational climate that is blame free and risk free and promotes innovation. 5 4 3 2 1

36. The chief school administrator has monitored and evaluated their implementation of site-based management. 5 4 3 2 1

37. Rewards and incentives have encouraged personal and professional growth. 5 4 3 2 1

38. Site-based management has provided a professional work environment for teachers. 5 4 3 2 1

39. Building principals have been given the resources to provide time to teachers for implementation efforts. 5 4 3 2 1

40. The responsibility for assessment of the process of site-based management has been given to teachers and the building principals. 5 4 3 2 1

41. Teachers are provided with the support of consultants during the implementation process. 5 4 3 2 1

42. The staff development program has provided for follow-up activities planned to meet teachers' needs as they arose. 5 4 3 2 1

43. Teachers and the principal have been involved in the evaluation of the implementation of site-based management. 5 4 3 2 1

44.	Staff development began with an orientation to site-based management followed by additional staff development (workshops, collegial planning, team seminars, consultant input).	5 4 3 2 1
45.	Evaluation data is utilized by principals and teachers to review and modify the implementation of site-based management.	5 4 3 2 1
46.	The teachers participated in staff development activities that included problem solving, consensus building and team building.	5 4 3 2 1
47.	The district has developed teacher support and understanding of site-based management and its implications.	5 4 3 2 1
48.	The district has provided for teacher, principal and parent input in the preparation of goals.	5 4 5 2 1
49.	The district has provided for the institutionalization of site-based management by on-going staff development activities.	5 4 3 2 1
50.	The district has provided teachers with workshops, retreats and seminars to accommodate the acquiring of new knowledge, new skills and new roles.	5 4 3 2 1
51.	The district has clarified site-based management and has gradually introduced changes to provide for the acceptance of site-based management.	5 4 5 2 1
52.	Teachers participate in the development of goals and objectives at the school site.	5 4 3 2 1
53.	Teachers and the principal work collaboratively to develop a positive climate for change.	5 4 3 2 1
54.	The district develops and supports policies for the implementation of site-based management.	5 4 3 2 1

Part III — Success of Implementation

Please indicate the degree of success of implementation of site-based management in your school. Circle the response that best describes the success of that implementation based upon your answers in Part II.

Most Successful	Very Successful	Moderately Successful	Least Successful	Not Successful

APPENDIX E: Chronbach's Alpha Reliability Technique

Cronbach's Alpha is the recommended reliability analysis technique for surveys and questionnaires (Nunnaly, J.C. Psychometric Theory, Second Edition. New York, McGraw Hill Book Company 1978. p. 230). The table below presents the Cronbach's Alpha reliability coefficients for each scale on the Teacher Focused Activities Questionnaire. In most cases, the reliabilities of the scales were satisfactory, at or above 0.70. However, some scales, including feelings/beliefs, physical emotion, environment, and resources for learning had unreliable items removed in order to raise the scale reliability.

COEFFICIENT ALPHA RELIABILITIES FOR THE TEACHER FOCUSED ACTIVITIES QUESTIONNAIRE

Scale	Number of Questions	Cronbach's Alpha Reliability Coefficients
Section A		
Responsibilities	3	.67
Feedback	6	.88
Resources	8	.87
Feelings/Beliefs*	1	N/A
Section B		
Principal Involvement	10	.86
Parent Involvement	5	.80
School Communication/Coord	6	.85
Concern for Students	5	.82
Physical/Emotional Environment**	10	.76
TCM	7	.81
Resources for Learning***	4	.66
Teacher Support	8	.83

** Question 10 deleted, 20 withheld from analysis because it is used as an independent variable*

*** Questions 41, 50, and 52 deleted*

***Questions 53 and 57 deleted